ROLE OF STUDENTS IN FREEDOM MOVEMENT

With a Special Reference to Madras Presidency

CHECKED 2001

V. SANKARAN NAIR

KONARK PUBLISHERS PVT LTD

KONARK PUBLISHERS PVT LTD
A-149, Main Vikas Marg, Delhi - 110092

NOT TO BE ISSUED ON LOAN
DEPOSIT
OR SPECIMEN

COPYRIGHT © V. SANKARAN NAIR, 1990

C. C. L. ASHOKNAGAR
HYDERABAD.

THE PUBLICATION OF THIS BOOK HAS BEEN FINANCIALLY SUPPORTED BY THE INDIAN COUNCIL OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH, AND THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FACTS STATED OR OPINIONS EXPRESSED IS ENTIRELY OF THE AUTHOR AND NOT OF THE COUNCIL.

CHECKED 2001 CHECKED 1994
H. C. G. S.
C, Acc, No... 159490
B.L. Acc. No.- 53577
Class No,... 323.2095482
Book No... S52R
VR: P; COST:

Lasertypeset at Siba-Exim Pvt. Ltd., Delhi and printed at Gopsons Papers Pvt. Ltd., Noida.

Preface

DURING the British Raj, the students of India were on the horns of a dilemma. Education was considered a licence to a government job. The Government were unable to provide employment opportunities to all the educated. After several years of education one had to be content with a clerical job or rot as an educated unemployed. Soon, the inherent weaknesses in the British educational system, coupled with the general political unrest all around, urged the students to play a role in the politics of the nation.

The values and goals set by an individual student may be wholly unique. But the aim of the student community or the youth as a whole varies, depending on whether he lives in a developed, developing, underdeveloped or undeveloped country, or in the socialist countries of eastern Europe or in Communist China. Indian students live in a microcosm of this environment. During the colonial period they had the freedom of India as their goal, which motivated them to take an active part in the nationalistic politics. Forty years after independence, India began to be ranked with the developing countries. The children of the affluent families went astray and were negative in behaviour. Another category of students were contented with securing jobs as a means of livelihood. The students who had an access to the Marxian ideology held aloft the success of the communist regime. Such a phenomenon was observed during the Quit India movement, when the All India Students Federation was virtually split into two.

For a proper appreciation of the evolution of the student movement as a phenomenon in Indian politics, the study should extend to the whole of India. Such a comprehensive study is the need of the hour, when a big chunk of the student community has been asked to participate in the electroal process and to exercise their franchise in the general elections. This has given students a recognition and a new responsibility in the society. It is here that he needs a new direction and leadership to carry forward the unfinished revolution of the days of the freedom struggle to new dimensions. India at present is passing through a difficult phase. Terrorism, communalism and violence of all kinds are being witnessed in their worst forms. In such situations, we

want leaders who can take the people in the right direction, and no doubt, the students who are guided by circumstances have to play mighty role in the regeneration of the society.

The present study, which constitutes a major part of my thesis, is a sequel to my previous publications, *Swadeshi Movement: Beginnings of Student Unrest in South India* and *How Students Wrought for Freedom: A Collection of Documents: 1914-1919*. I spent long hours of work in the National Archives, Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Library in New Delhi, Tamilnadu Archives, Archives of the Theosophical Society, Connemara Library and the Secretariat Library of Trivan-drum. I acknowledge promptly my gratitude to these institutions for their valuable help with which source materials, could be consulted for the purpose of my study.

Behind every creative work there will be encouragement of the people who happen to be in the immediate vicinity. In this regard, I gratefully acknowledge the friendly assistance and guidance rendered to me by Prof. T.K. Ravindran, Vice Chancellor, University of Calicut, Prof. M.P. Sreekumaran Nair, and Prof. A.P. Ibrahim Kunju (Dept. of History, University of Calicut). I am also grateful to Mr N. Krishnan Nair I.P.S., and Prof. V.K. Moothathu for their valuable suggestions and constructive criticisms.

It is noteworthy to mention the help rendered by my wife Kamala, during the process of preparation of the manuscript. Finally I thank Konark Publishers Pvt Ltd for the printing and prompt publication of the book.

V. SANKARAN NAIR

Contents

1.	Roots of Student Unrest	1
2.	Beginnings of Student Movement: The Swadeshi Movement	26
3.	The Gathering Storm : The Impact of Home Rule Movement on Students	45
4.	Towards an Educational Penal Code	57
5.	Non-Cooperation and Education	72
6.	Civil Disobedience Movement	93
7.	Prelude to Quit India Movement	118
8.	Quit India Movement	142
9.	On the Eve of Independence	176
10.	Conclusion	195
	Chronology of Student Organizations	204
	Appendix	208
	Bibliograpy	227
	INDEX	233

Chapter 1

Roots of Student Unrest

THE term 'student unrest' has been used here to denote the situation that existed in the academic environment in India during the freedom struggle. Since the situation grew in volume and intensity expressions like indiscipline, rebellion and revolution came into vogue. Without discipline, there is no true education. Discipline means either a process of training or the condition generated by such a process. As is the process, so will be the result. Everything depends on the end that the disciplinarian has in view. Fagin, a character in *Oliver Twist*, was a strict disciplinarian, but the way he trained his pupils was 'proper' only from the point of view of a master thief. Since western education was one of the causes responsible for the genesis of political movement, the political content in the commotion that reigned the campus during the British period had a significant role in the country's struggle for freedom. A probe into the psychology of the parties involved therein has become essential to unravel the truth.

Speaking about the causes of unrest in India in the "Indian debate" in the House of Lords in mid-1908, Lord Curzon said: "It will be admitted by everyone that first and foremost among these is the education we have given to the people of the country. It has taught the people of India the catchwords of western civilisation without inspiring them with its ideas or spirit of inculcating its sobriety. It has sharpened their intellect without forming their character."[1] Lord Curzon received cheers for his appreciation of the Indian education in the House of Lords. Morley considered this diagnosis of education to be thoroughly sound.[2] But the debate in the House for suggestions on the mode of education in India, evoked only the narrow views they had held on colonial education.

Education in India, at the dawn of the eighteenth century, was neither uniform nor settled. However, as the East India Company's administration progressed, a beginning was made for some worthwhile education by the Company and as well as the Christian missionaries. The founding of the Calcutta Madrassa in 1781 and the establishment of the Sanskrit College at Benares in 1792 were the notable examples

of individual efforts. The East India Company Act of 1813 inserted an educational clause enabling the Governor-General to earmark not less than a lakh of rupees annually for education. This provision necessitated an agency to initiate and control development. The result was the setting up of Committees of Public Instruction in Bengal (1823), Madras (1826) and elsewhere. The orientalists Vs Anglicists between 1782 and 1835 was significant. Orientalists were traditionalists who believed in education on oriental lines, and the Anglicists, on the other hand, aimed at inculcating a modern form of culture through the English language. The controversy ended in favour of the Anglicists with the Minute of 1835 of Lord T.B. Macaulay, then Legal Member of the Executive Council, followed by that of the two Governors-General, Lord William Bentinck in 1835 and Lord Auckland in 1839, endorsing Macaulay's policy.[3] With this, education became a responsibility of the state. The years that followed 1854 found the establishment of the Department of Public Instruction in all provinces, Universities in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras and steady increase in the number of schools and colleges all over India. The other milestones in India's march towards modern education were the appointment of the Educational Commission of 1882, the Resolution of the Government of India of 1904 on educational policy, the Indian Universities Act of 1904, the Resolution of the Government of India, in 1913 the appointment of the Calcutta University Commission 1917-1919, and the passing of the Compulsory Primary Acts in the various provinces in 1919 and after.

In the beginning, English education was a heady wine which carried many people off their feet. As to its impact, Earl Ronaldshay, once Governor of Bengal, wrote that "thereafter the wave of western learning was poured with disastrous results into the old bottles of Hinduism and there is no doubt that it went to the heads of young Bengal".[4] T.B. Macaulay, the architect of modern education in India, hoped to produce, by the introduction of English as the medium of instruction, "a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern, a class of person Indian in blood and colour but English in tastes, in opinion, in morals and intellect."[5] The impact of English thought on Indian religion and philosophy was meagre, since the old and established traditions were strong enough to resist the new doctrines.[6] But in the field of politics, the two main tenets of English liberalism – nationalism and democracy – found an easy audience and

left their impact on the political development of the country.

Indian nationalism was, to a great extent, the offspring of the economic, political, educational and missionary impact of the west. It originated in the minds of the early generations of the western-educated elite. The Bhadralok, the literary class of Bengal and the Chitpavan Brahmins of Bombay were harbingers of Indian nationalism. The two groups cooperated with the British Government. In the course of time, the growth of British power by annexation, and its revenue, judicial and educational policies, were subject to severe criticism. With the increasing opposition to the colonial rule, nationalism grew with differing intensity and encompassing the different strata of society and regions hitherto unaffected by the political activism. This was remarkable between 1870 and 1892, and is considered as the second phase of nationalism. The nationalists of this phase belonged to the generation born in the years around 1840.[7] They aroused political consciousness culminating in the founding of the Indian National Congress.

The *guru* is reproduced in his *chela*, the teacher in his disciple. This was so with the first generation of western educated youngmen in Bengal. Their sense of justice was so strong that they readily responded to all sympathetic treatment by their teachers. The conversion of Kali Charan Banerjee to Christianity was traced to his great reverence for Dr. Duff. Men like David Hare and D'Rozio[8] in Calcutta or Wilson in Bombay, or Miller in Madras compelled reverence and devotion from their pupils by the native charm and strength of their personalities. But it was soon realised that English education had denied the liberty "on the microscopical minority of the educated."[9]

There were men among professors and masters who recalled the genuine master-disciple relation of yore. But there was also a leaven of the lower type, responsible for bringing discredit to a noble profession. The talented Indian professors were amazed that most foreign professors were freshers given high positions. The report of Sir Ashutosh Mukerjea Committee of Inquiry on the Calcutta Presidency College scandal[10] referred to this disparity and recommended the reconstitution of the educational service, with a view to placing the Indian and European members upon an absolutely equal footing in matters of pay and precedence.[11] That was a recognition of the evil of racial discrimination that existed in the educational service.

Mrs. Annie Besant, an Irish woman by birth but an Indian by

adaptation and a fighter for self-government for India, charged the Madras University with sowing the seeds of disloyalty in the hearts of youngmen, making them susceptible to anarchical ideas. She vehemently denounced the government and the University in the following terms at a crowded meeting convened to protest against the failure of 2,800 youths at the Secondary School Leaving Certificate and intermediate examinations. "The authorities want to strangle higher eucation and so keep India down ... What, do you think, is in the hearts of these 2800 repelled youths? What but anger, a passionate sense of wrong and resentment against a gross injustice and a desperate feeling that they are frustrated on everyside? ... Education to them is not a serpent of wisdom that gives life, but a serpent of evil that stings to death, and so they would fain strangle it, or at least change it and narrow down its scope, destroy the possibilities in the future, lest they should not be strong enough to hold their equals and are not willing to be their slaves, and there I feel the danger."[12]

About the education in India, Lala Lajpat Rai said that it was neither universal, nor compulsory nor free. He said that the nature of education provided in India was antiquated, whereas the expenditure on education was trifling, in comparison with that of other countries.[13] He also noted that the vocational training was neglected, training in skilled labour and teaching of modern languages and modern commerce was not provided for.[14]

The Court of Directors, in their Despatch of 1854, laid down as a sound principle that European knowledge should be brought within the reach of all classes by means of the vernaculars. The constant complaint against the excessive emphasis on English though it invited the notice of the official intelligence, received little attention in the Resolution of the Governor-in-Council of 1904.[16]

Referring to the unhappy students with two marks short in English, Earnest Wood was reminded of the case of a boy who was in Form VI, in the first year of the SSLC scheme in his school, when he was the headmaster there. Though the boy was weak in English he was good and hardworking. He said that he nearly detained the boy after the school selection examination. He was weak in English when he completed his Certificate but was admitted to college by a shrewd and kindly Principal. Later he came out first in the University for the B.A. examination in his special subject. Earnest Wood remarked that the boy was poor "and nobody would have helped him further financially

if he had gone up under the new restrictions and been among the noneligibles at School Final. As it has happened, before many years are over, he will be known as an authority upon something more useful and precious to India than ever English can expect to be."[17]

The reason for the failure of Indian students in the English paper, in spite of their ability to learn languages and capacity for hard work, was to be found in the books that were prescribed to them. They were provided with uninspiring and unattractive baby-books which were sheer twaddles. Macaulay's essays, Shelley's burning poems on liberty, the literary works of Milton, Burke or Mill, were tabooed to them. Such literature were dubbed dangerous for the Indian lads for they were pregnant with the concept of liberty. It was against such a frame of European mind that Mrs. Annie Besant flung her attack. Indian boys would learn English with fondness, she said, if they were provided with the literature which made English boys patriots, poets, philoso-phers and martyrs. To the youngmen must be imparted such an education as would enable them to stand face to face with their counterparts from other countries in the great international council.

In regard to the noble quality of patriotism, she said that the public schools in England were the nurseries of patriotism, "and the books the boys read, the recitations they declaim, the songs they sing, are redolent of this heroic quality."[18] These schools sent out into the world streams of soldiers, civil servants and explorers. If they died for the country their names were emblazoned on the school Roll of Honour which inspired the succeeding generations of boys. The way to patriotism, for the Englishmen, was the way of education. The position in India was absolutely the opposite. An Indian boy was at a loss "to learn patriotism from Southey's Life of Nelson, or somebody else's Life of Wellingdon, from the old Stories of Clive and of Hastings."[19]

The generality of Englishmen who came to the Government of India service considered themselves to be in a conquered country. Even the European teachers recruited were not liberal-minded enough to rise above this petty idea and proved incapable of sympathising with those whom they were called upon to teach.[20] In a long article written by Rabindranath Tagore after the Calcutta Presidency College incident, he said that the western teacher carried with his person the emblem of sovereign power.[21] In these circumstances, the throne took the place of the *guru's* seat. This inevitably made the relation between a teacher and his student to go down to that of an official and his subordinate

rather than remain that of a *guru* and his *chela*.

The absolute authority of the teachers began to grow since the Universities Act of Lord Curzon came into force in 1904. As the natural concomitance of all absolute power, the absolute authority of teachers also outgrew itself and began to burst. The process got momentum since the days of the anti-partition movement. The various orders relating to the concern of students with politics, the general educational system with its negation of all emotional development and its encouragement of unsuitable and denationalising tendencies, and the mishandling of student situations, were its symptoms.

The British administration in India by its policies provoked the youth and the students, and the latter in a fit of anger and revenge took the path of agitation and protest. For instance, the British authorities in Bengal not only flogged, expelled, rusticated and chilled them, but also doubted their patriotic motives.[22] The Bengali students were very proud and sensitive, responsive to affection, with a passionate love and devotion, easiest to be led and most impossible to be driven. Recollecting her days in the Benares Central Hindu College, Annie Besant records: "We welcomed boys who came to us as haters of the English, and transformed them into lovers. Some came to us anarchists, and left us law-abiding reformers."[23]

Discipline as an end in itself involves a form of slavery. This was true of the Principals who were generally Englishmen. When they faced difficulties, they were led into tyrannical ways by their fellow-Englishmen in exclusive clubs and government departments, and were governed by the spirit of the magistrate and the collector.[24] The position can be made clear by examining the views of an academic bureaucracy on sedition and the observations and suggestions on the problem by a host of 'loyal teachers'.

It was considered that the spirit of discontent towards the British Government was confined to the literate classes. To a large extent the nature of the discontent was attributed to the intellectual dissatisfaction.[25] Those who worked for ending the British rule were broadly grouped into two classes, the passive resisters and the revolutionaries. The revolutionaries aimed at freeing India from the British yoke by any means. The Government of India viewed with great concern the fact that this class consisted, for the most part, of youths who were still at school or college, and of youngmen who had not long passed that period of their lives.[26] It was held that the persistent preaching of

sedition had a marked effect upon the youth and thus created a favourable recruiting ground for the party of revolutionary violence.[27] The Government of India believed that the seditious movement was mainly due to "ignorance and misapprehension of the nature of consequences of British rule in India."[28] The government considered that the task of combating sedition was the responsibility of all branches of administration. It was observed that the educational officers of all ranks were in a peculiarly favourable position for fighting the spread of seditious views.

In 1910, Dr. Bourne, the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, was asked by the Government to enumerate the causes and suggest methods of checking sedition. Instead of confining himself to finding out the methods, Dr. Bourne sought the advice of certain selected Principals and Inspectors. However, the answers received failed to shed any new light on the particular issue. But the answers covered a wide range of information. As sedition was absent in the campuses of the Madras Presidency, the officers consulted answered either on the secret of maintaining discipline or on the supposed causes of sedition and on the plugging of the loopholes in the same.

According to Rev. J.D.W. Sewell, Manager, St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, the students of that time believed that "the Brithish are ruling India with a rod of iron solely in their own interests and that no amelioration of their lamentable condition is to be hoped for from the British unless it be exhorted from them."[29] This was considered to be the result of political propaganda made in the free Indian press and the condition of the student mind which was influenced by the forces of prejudice rather than by the arguments of reason.

Repression was not the sole answer for dealing with sedition. Two things to be aimed at according to Skinner, Principal, Madras Christian College, were combating "the feeling of estrangement between Indian and European, which is a phase of the present situation, and along with that, using, every opportunity that offers itself of inculcating sound political ideas and more generally of training students in the practice of patient, accurate and independent observation and in the habit of bringing generalities to the touchstone of fact."[30] Again he said: "The Indian student may be made to feel that so far as British authority as represented for him by that of the college to which he belongs, an authority that is not antagonistic to his best aspirations, but one that may be trusted to further them in every legitimate way."[31] But Sewell

advocated resort to repression by whatever means to suppress sedition. On the other hand, Skinner pointed out that the colleges had a special responsibility to fulfil in the matter of diffusing sound ideas and cultivating habits of sober and independent reflection. This responsibility was most distinctly realised in connection with the subjects of history and economics. While teaching these subjects, Skinner believed that the Professors ought to be aware of the different conditions that caused the political development of England and India respectively, and the prevalent misrepresentation and fallacies regarding the political and economic relations between nations. The teacher should take pains to place before the student supporting facts, so as to enable him to correct himself. The teaching of Indian history posed the danger that it might imbibe into the minds of the boys from an early age distorted views of the past conditions of India and of the aims and character of the English conquest. The special difficulty was to be surmounted by entrusting the teaching of Indian history to unprejudiced men who were thoroughly qualified and by using suitable text books.

While treating the economics of international trade, the Professor had to discuss the then current topics such as the 'drain', 'overtaxation' and the 'land revenue'. Here, a protectionist stand was to be avoided to take the wind out of the politician's sail. In teaching these topics, the Professors should be able to win the confidence of the students by sympathising with their legitimate aspirations and speaking to them the truth so far as they could understand it. Another tendency of some text books prescribed for teaching was to go to the very reverse and undo the intended aim. Lee Warner's *Citizen of India* was cited as one of them. The charge against it was that the book narrated how the Pax Britannica rescued India from the state of insecurity to life and property. But the attention of the students was not drawn to the dubious methods employed by the Company's agents. This led students to retain the bad and ignore the good aspects of the British rule.[32]

Rev. A.F. Gardiner, Principal, S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly, wanted to scrutinise some of the history books in use, as he considered that many of them were seditious by implication. He also pointed out that the circulation of a large number of novels was to be checked. Such novels damaging the character of the British were more pernicious than downright sedition. He cited as example the novels of Reynolds. Some of the pamphlets under circulation, branded as seditious, were 'Beware of the traitors,' 'Bande Matarm,' 'Secret History of Indian Mutiny,' etc.[33]

Officers of the Education Department in general and teachers in particular, it was considered, were in a peculiarly favourable position for combating the existing fallacies and mischievous tendencies and it was believed that sedition would become a thing of the past if only the teachers did their duty properly.

In order to make the boys and youngmen loyal to the English Empire, it was advocated that systematic instruction of the duties of subjects to their rulers should be given. They were to be reminded also of the benefit of British rule. Lecturers in history had to be tactful in answering questions of a disloyal tone.[34] For achieving this K. Ramanujachari suggested the introduction in schools of a series of readers dealing with different periods of Indian history comparing the peaceful revolution of that time with the anarchy of the recent past.[35] The Education Department was asked to insist upon employing a set of loyal and contented teachers. For this the teaching profession must be made attractive by giving proper training and adequate payment. During the training period, at the training colleges, the politics of the teachers should be carefully watched and those having political tendency of an 'undesirable kind' should be sent away.

The responsibility of the teachers never ceased with their work within the four walls of the lecture room. They were required to keep constant touch with the students. Their visits to the dwelling places of the students would afford them an excellent opportunity to put an effective check on the circulation of seditious pamphlets.[36]

P.P. Bratthwaite, Inspector of Schools, VIII circle, viewed that the reading rooms and debating societies inside and outside the campus were the other centres for the dissemination of political ideas. He pointed out that the government should undertake by legislation "to nip in the bud the organized propaganda through newspapers, bar libraries, secret societies among school boys (with big names at their head), etc . . . ."[37] He argued that the attitude of criticism rather than confidence to rulers makes them viable to extreme opinion.

In the Madras Presidency College, the Principal permitted students to read only newspapers 'expunged' by him. But while they kept the windy side of the law, the Principal said, it seemed hard to forbid them. It was suggested that the students should be discouraged from associating themselves with societies and associations which have no connection with the college, as those associations were mostly hotbeds of sedition.

An educational experiment was made at the Madras Christian College where, reading circle was formed by drawing a small number of boys from all classes of the college under the leadership of the Professor of History. They met once in a week for the purpose of studying and discussing some work on Indian economics. This experiment proved a success as a means of imparting accurate knowledge and forming sound judgement on the subject of Indian economics. Similarly, another attempt was made there, by encouraging students to undertake holiday tasks. Topics relating to past as well as present conditions of India were suggested to them. After consulting original sources, they were expected to submit a short essay on the outcome of their investigations. This experiment helped the authorities to watch the political content of their reading.[38]

In the Presidency College, Madras, the debates in the College Union Society, on subjects connected with public affairs were the means to judge the political content of the students' thought. Debates were held in the presence of European members of the college staff on topics approved by the Principal. Subjects set for English compositions were mostly connected with public affairs. Treatment of the subjects on such occasions was found fair and balanced. These stood as proofs to show that the students were on their guard though the college may be a hotbed of sedition.

The suggestion made by Rabindranath Tagore, is apt to be recalled at this juncture. He said, "those teachers, whom nature has marked out for gaolers, drill-sergeants, and exorcists, should never be given the special care of students. Only those are fit for such work, who have a natural feeling of respect even for the young in age and in wisdom, who understand the Sanskrit verse, – 'Forgiveness is the adornment of the powerful,' and who have no hesitation in accepting their students as their friends."[39]

All statesmen who were concerned with India and men of public opinion regarded education, more on western lines, to be the greatest need of the country... But the problem as understood by the *Englishman* was very curious. It stated that according to the bulk of the European officers of the government and the non-official European and Anglo-Indian community "there is no greater evil in this country than the institutions which are forcing a western education upon an oriental people, whose social customs and traditions seem to make it impossible for a man who has had any education to earn a living except

upon certain very rigidly defined paths, which are already overcrowded."[40] According to the *Englishman*, the sovereign remedy for stopping the breeding of a revolutionary movement was the curtailing of western education.

At the time when western education was introduced in India, the motive of the government was to solve the problem of finding a cheap agency for carrying on the subordinate work of administration in its various departments. The requirements of the time determined the lines of the educational system. The educational institutions fulfilled the purpose for which they were devised. At the end of their education the students looked up to the government for employment. The growth of educational facilities and the increase in the number of educated men outgrowing the government requirements resulted in the beginning of educated unemployment.[41] It is true that these educated unemployed, distributed in various provinces, in varying degrees of acuteness, served as combustibles at the time of revolution. The danger of such a class to the existence of a sort of intellectual proletariat, not without reasonable grievances, forms a menace to good government. . . So long as the great mass of the nation's intelligent manhood is driven, in ever-increasing numbers, along the same, often unfruitful, course of study, which created expectation that can not be fulfilled and actually unfits those who pursue it from undertaking many useful occupations necessary for the welfare of the country, any Government however it may be constituted, whether it be bureaucratic or popular, must find its work hampered by an unceasing stream of criticism and a natural demand for relief which cannot possibly be met."[42]

Instead of imparting an education which may help the lads to find their way not only in the Council and the Supreme Council at Delhi but also in the Imperial parliament of the British Empire, they found fault with the education by saying that it made anarchy and fomented unrest.

One of the most important side-issues of the problem of education was the relation of poverty with education. Much useful information, in this regard was to be found in the speeches of Justice Ranade who was able to establish that the rate of mortality among graduates of this country especially those that pursued higher studies was quite abnormal in comparison with that of the people in general of the same age. Among the contributory causes, he gave precedence to "the abnormal poverty of many of those who take advantage of the university system of education". He adds, "with Scotch pertinacity they leave their

homes, flock into large towns, and while studying hard for themselves, manage to earn their living by working extra hours or depending upon the charity of others. This is a feature of student life in this country which the English people very naturally failed to understand. No wonder that youngmen so brought up in the prime of life succumb to the first serious disorders which attacks their system."[43] Life history of hundreds of poor graduates was perused before this accusation was made. In the light of the 'slaughter of the innocents' to an unusual extent, the university was asked to consider the question of the loss of brilliant but poor lives cut short by the fear of slaughter or by the anguish of slaughter.

Speaking on the average type of the students of Madras, J.C. Rollo, Principal of Pachaiyappa's College, said that the average student was the one that came from the moffusil. These students embarked on an adventure compared with the experience of a student going to an English University. Penniless as he often was, his university career depended on the generosity of the rich gentry.[44] He said that the character of the English student could never permit begging. Since charity was a religious matter in India, begging was justified. But this was a very mistaken judgement. While education was free in England the Indian students had to pay for it exorbitantly or go without it. The English, whose wealth was calculated at 6660 shillings per head of the whole population, paid fifty shillings in taxes whereas the Indians paid 3 s 7 d out of the average income per head of the population.[45] In England 6 million children were in schools out of a population of some 36 million and in India 2.6 million out of 312 million, were at school.[46] The English made free and compulsory education possible, but in India, education was neither compulsory nor free. This added strain to the poverty of the Indian parents, and suffering to their children.

Graduates of the universities were, according to Ranade, a spent-up force and they largely suffered from "nervous vital exhaustion and atrophy of energies" owing to the nature of the activities of university imposed on them. Ranade beautifully conveyed this idea thus: as a result of the system of education prevalent in those days "the bow is too much bent, and when it is relaxed, it refuses not to bend again except under pressure and enforced orders". Finally, he sums up his brilliant analysis thus: "In a word, the students exist for the university, and the university, it is thought, has not been created for the students, and has no business to adapt itself to local needs and conditions."[47]

This verdict was made in 1894, and in the years that elapsed little effort had been made to take advantage of this warning.

Owing partly to deliberate policy and partly to circumstances, government service became the highest prospect that lay before an Indian middle class man. Academic qualifications were important in securing positions. Indian parents considered it necessary to keep their children, overbusy with school and college lessons in their pursuit of academic distinctions. Parents of the poor class were soon to follow this middle class example. This category of students who were forced to take up the various burdens of family life yet young, sooner than did their counterparts in other lands, were forced to devote more time to their books at the expense of the pleasures of well-spent leisure. Social customs such as early marriage prevalent at that time went to add to the grown-up-ness of the Indian children.

Inadequate hostel facilities posed another serious problem. Bratthwaite pointed out that the boys who stayed away from their parental care were said to be under the care of nominal guardians. The dwelling places of these so-called guardians may sometimes be public hotels or undesirable surroundings where boys mix with travellers, vakils, touts and the scum of the place. Sometimes these places may be virtually brothels, though not officially known so.[48] They were left at liberty with the least supervision either by their parents or by the officials. Such boys may be members of literary or debating societies presided over by vakils or agents for spreading sedition. Bratthwaite suggested that such boys should stay in the school hostel, failing which they should be accommodated in licensed dwelling places under proper supervision. The boys were to be dissociated from any club or society except those managed within the school or receiving the sanction of the headmaster.[49]

Though the baneful influences of anti-social elements thrown upon students were much exaggerated, and ways for removing this defect were suggested, the insanitary condition of the dwelling places of the hundreds of students, who were unable to secure accommodation in the existing hostels, was hardly noticed. In some places where a large number of students mess, the food served was improperly cooked and the vessels in which water was stored were not cleaned for years.[50] These insanitary living conditions were to add injury to the meagre health of the students on account of want of adequate medical care and physical training.

This came to the notice of Sir C. Sankaran Nair, member of the Viceroy's Executive Council in charge of education, who made an appraisal of the bad physical condition of the boys and recognised the fact that the anaemic brain of half-starved child cannot work, and found it unfair to put on it an increased strain.[51] Influences of inheritance, heredity, social customs and the environment of the child and his parents, were also responsible for the low expectation of life that existed in India at that time.

During the early days of its administration the English East India Company "feared the evil consequences of education for the ruled and the ruled anticipated no good results for themselves."[52] Hence in educational and social matters, the Company followed a policy of neutrality and non-interference. But, after 1813, out of utilitarian necessity, modern educational system was introduced. The first signs of their fear of "the evil consequences of education" came true in 1869, when four Indians came out successful in the Civil Service Examination held that year. Under the English educational systems, unlike the Hindu and Muslim educational systems, students irrespective of caste or creed were offered education. When English education was made a necessary qualification for government jobs, this measure quickened the process of social change in the Indian society. This was started in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth century with the Hindus seeking middle class posts in the bureaucracy through a literary education. Muslims, the erstwhile ruling class, failed to rise to the occasion; this led to their displacement by the western-educated Hindus in matters of administration and status in society. This created tension between the Hindus and Muslims, especially in the north. In the south, the Brahmins who formed only three per cent of the population were the first to qualify themselves for positions in the British Government. But, tremendous changes began to occur in South India with the non-Brahmin caste groups acquiring educational qualifications.[53] This upset the equilibrium between South Indian Brahmins and non-Brahmin elite. By the time the Home rule movement was launched, the Brahmins were dominating the fields of administration, politics as well as education. This position cast a shadow of doubt among the non-Brahmins as to their future, in the self-government run by the Brahmins. No wonder, that helped the non-Brahmins to find salvation in the British rule and reject the Home Rule and the limited nationalism of the Brahmins. This forced the caste

Hindus to liberate themselves from the shackles of dark superstition and the depressed masses from the age-old social tyranny, in order to achieve the much coveted national independence. In this context nationalism "was not the cause of reintegration, but the result of an interaction between social forces and political necessities."[54] On realisation of the fact that "if nationalism had to become a dynamic force, the various communities, castes and sects would have to unite in a common endeavour of national uplift and give impetus to the already pevailing spirit of nationalism,"[55] elder politicians started social movements.

The dividing line between the early student movement and social movements is difficult to draw since the students can be considered as the potential intellectuals. The students had a status in the society as they were recipients of modern education leading to covetable positions in the legal, teaching and civil service cadres. They could also gather the confidence of the nationalist leaders as they carried with them the spirit of revolt against the foreigners.[56] Indian students who learnt western science and social science were found to be an effective weapon of social change. The trends of the social revolution that was taking place in the Indian society percolated into the minds of the students, turning their personal and ideological frustrations against the foreigners.

The degenerated social customs prevalent in the Indian society at that time were causes of disgrace, humiliation and frustration leading to many ticklish emotional issues. P.T. Rajan, a prominent Justice party leader and ex-cabinet member, recollecting his experience of the odious Brahmin social behaviour, said that his transfer from a "village to a town school meant a change, from taking drinking water from the same pot as Brahmins (in the village) to taking drinking water from a separate pot—a—pot used by all other non-Brahmin castes (in the town). Again, he said, that the cup he used to drink water from a Brahmin's house would be subsequently set before the fire to be purified.[57] In some places students from the depressed community were not allowed to sit along with their colleagues belonging to upper classes. They had to undergo many ordeals of inhuman nature which were remnants of a stagnant society. The frustration of the students on this count forced them to work out different strategies to do away with the degenerated social customs. They incited their colleagues from the lower castes not to observe these customs. Then they took the lead in

bringing about cosmopolitan service in the matter of refreshment in the educational institutions. It is worthwhile to recount the experience of K.R. Elankath, who was a student of the University College, Trivandrum, and later a Minister of the erstwhile Travancore state. In social gatherings in the college, he observed that the refreshments were served in separate halls on caste basis. On the eve of the college day celebrations of 1923, he moved a resolution in the College Union debating society to the effect that there should be only a cosmopolitan service at college functions. If this was not implemented, the resolution stated, the students would boycott the functions and observe fasting and prayer. The college authorities promised to implement the resolution the next year. Not satisfied with this, many students resorted to fasting and prayer.[58] According to Mr. K. Santhanam, an Orthodox South Indian Brahmin who had observed caste and untouchability as a boy, said that, the intimate social contact of thousands of national workers in jails as equals and comrades in utter disregard of all rules of caste had brought the day much nearer to the end of the caste system.[59]

The education portfolios in the State came under the control of state ministers with the advent of diarchy. As a result, the enrolment to higher education rose from 60,000 in 1921 to 1,20,000 in 1936.[60] These students drawn from various castes, creeds, and linguistic regions, experienced common alienation in the cosmopolitan cities, where they pursued their education. The government facilitated the enrolment of students in large numbers without curtailing the defective sides of the existing educational system. This lack of imagination on the part of the government complicated the academic environment. Poverty of the students, the spectre of unemployment, competition for the limited number of jobs and isolation of low-caste students added to the general prevailing frustration and stimulated student unrest.

Use of "tactless expressions" on the part of the teachers was one of the causes attributed to the scandal in the Calcutta Presidency College, by the committee of enquiry. A Professor at a meeting of students observed that the mission of Alexander the Great was to Hellenise the "barbarian" people. Just like that, the mission of the English was also, the Professor said, to "civilise" the Indians. The term "barbarian" meant, in the liberal Greek sense, "non-Hellenic". But the word was misunderstood and it created bitterness among students. "A young European Professor asked certain students in the Presidency College

why they were howling like wild beasts. Another asked, on a different occasion, why they were chattering like monkeys, while a third is reported to have enquired of his students why they behaved like coolie."[61] Similar instances in other colleges in Bengal as well as elsewhere were reported.

For roughly handling a college student at St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, a highly-placed missionary was fined Rs. 5 by the Magistrate. There was another commotion in the Madras Christian College in 1886, when a Professor's language helped provoke Hindu religious feelings.[62] In the Wesley College High School, the self-respect of the boys was easily offended by the coarse and rough terms, like 'fool', 'rascal,' etc. Addressing the senate on the inadvisability of raising the percentage of passes in the Intermediate examinations, Rev. Macphail said, "if Rickshawallas were to be admitted into the college classes, then there would be tremendous slaughter of innocents."[63] Such offensive language of Englishmen served only to fan the agitational propensity of the student community.

The feeling of self-respect, pride of race and country, which made them resent insult and rebel against injustice, was one of the manifestations of the new life stirring the students of India at that time. The 'meek Hindu', who was always largely a creature of the Anglo-Indian imagination, began showing his old martial qualities and his intolerance to insult. Thus the students of the Presidency College, Calcutta, resented their Professor's rude language; the students of the Raja of Pithapur's College, Kakinada, resented being spied upon; and the students of the Christian College, Madras resented the language used by their Professors, Pittendrigh and Macphail, in the senate meeting. Rabindranath Tagore defended such manifestations of the high spirit of the Indian youth and remarked that "indeed, it would be a thousand pities if they did not."[64]

Of the reports on the progress of education in their respective provinces issued by several provincial administrations in 1918, the report of the Central Provinces touched on the influence of politics on students. The report conceded that politics had occupied the minds of the students, but delinked the influence of political meetings and agitations as a reason for the breach of discipline in colleges.[65] This was based on a false reading of the mind of the Indian students. An emasculated nation cannot be expected to admire any military hero, for such a nation was hardly allowed to have one from its own

countrymen. It was not so much different in other items like industrial enterprise, administrative ability, scholarship or sports. Primarily by forbidding students to meet their leaders and attend their meetings, they made 'politics' a curious subject. Denied of any sympathetic approach to their problem in the classroom, they took them out to the political leaders.

A veteran educationalist like C.F. Andrews, in his letter published in the *Tribune*, recalled the consequences of the Risely circular, which prohibited students attending political meetings. The circular appeared to him pernicious. According to him, "it emasculated our educational ideals. It was a betrayal of our Magna Charta of freedom as teachers."[66] Though the Risely circular was found unworkable and remained a dead letter since its promulgation, its evil influence continued to trail behind it. This was evident from the CID operations in colleges to an alarming extent. Bribery, training in spy work on fellow students, etc. were employed by the intelligence wing to sense the pulse of the students' movement and their attitude towards the British.[67] One of the evil effects of the circular was the dire legacy of suspicion behind it. Every political crisis was followed by CID investigations. This resulted in an atmosphere of suspicion and the seeds of distrust were sown between students and teachers. C.F. Andrews continued, 'the teachers are unable as heretofore, to gain the full confidence of their students."[68]

Rabindranath Tagore considered students at the college stage to be in a state of transition. They were coming out of school discipline into freedom for the first time in their lives. "And this new freedom is not merely outward. Their minds, also, have left the cage of syntax and spread their wings into the open air of ideas. They have gained their right to question and their right to judge for themselves. This transition period of life is full of sensitiveness. The least insult pierces to the quick. On the other hand, the simplest suggestion of love makes the heart glad . . . . This is the time when man is moulded by man."[69] The advent of the Europeans caused a thorough permutation in the attitude of students, teachers, parents and elders. In their anxiety to convert the youth of the country to Christianity, the missionaries unknowingly estranged the relation of the students with their elders and home thus undermining the discipline enjoined by the Hindu religion. This was soon to affect the close link between family life, school life and public life. This jeopardised the vital relationship which could have made a full man fit enough to serve his motherland.

This Indian situation was delineated by G.K. Gokhale, leader of moderates in the Indian National Congress, in one of his speeches at Bombay on 9 October 1909, as follows: "Influences are at work around us which bid every one, 'not sit nor stand, but go'. The very air we breathe is laden with a longing for change. Old beliefs are crumbling. New adjustments of ideas have become necessary, and amidst this general commotion which has been very properly called 'unrest', it was not to be expected that our students alone continue to stand where they did."[70]

Naturally enough the later day students had to turn their hearts away from things English, since they were forced to take English thought submissively. They did not accept the English learning and English literature as wholeheartedly as the first generation of Indian students did. This marked the beginning of a clash between the political mendicancy of the older generation and the cult of self-determination and self-reliance of the later generation. In regard to the degeneration of the English education in India, K.M. Panikkar said that "the schools and colleges taught youngmen the idea of liberty while the Government did everything to suppress it. In the education system, the Government created and maintained an opposition to itself on a plane where its own methods were ineffective."[71]

Demand for the new education and the challenge of the missionary initiative in it, gave birth to many associations.[72] Those alumni of the new schools who were encouraged to come together "both by the mystique of the syllabus they shared and by the ostracism they suffered at the hands of Orthodox society"[73] launched some other associations. Earliest of these associations organised in the presidency capitals and confined to language and interest areas, drew support from students or professional men or landlords or merchants.

As early as 1828, the pupils of the Hindu College, Calcutta formed an Academic Association. Another student club was the Society for the Acquisition of General Knowledge, formed in 1838. Dadabhai Naoroji, a Parsi and the leader of the Elphinstone College students, founded in Bombay the "Students Literary and Scientific Society" in 1848,[74] to serve the interests of the small community of students in Bombay. These associations were forums for discussing campus issues and not politics, but served as a recruiting ground for politicians of the 1870s. But with the formation of Students' Association in 1875, and the Indian Association later, the students of Bengal "shouted their way into the politics of Bengal"[75] and kept its momentum since then. Thus they

stole a lead from other provinces. The first manifestations of political consciousness among students in South India began to appear in the early 1880s. This was more evident among the students of Trivandrum College situated in the capital of the princely state of Travancore. The political views held by the students in 1882, can be traced to the articles the students contributed in the columns of *Western Star*, published by Hall Melville from British Cochin. These articles showed much concern on the importation of outsiders into the service of the state. The authors of these articles were G. Parameswaran Pillai, N. Raman Pillai and R. Ranga Rao. The Dewan singled them out and made way for their expulsion from the college. The furore over the expulsion roused much political consciousness among the people. Strenuous work of a band of youngmen kept the tempo of the agitation for a decade and "focussed for the time the attention of the outer world on the disabilities of the people of Travancore."[76]

The growing of political consciousness among students and the existence of many associations with a variety of interests took India to the highroad of modern politics. This helped the Indian elite to give shape to specific political organisations. British Indian Association in Calcutta, the Bombay Association and the Madras Native Association were the pioneers in this field. With the march of the Indian National Congress since 1885, students received lessons on matters concerned with national politics. Their service as volunteers in the annual gatherings of the Congress was lauded by the successive Congress Presidents. It would be interesting to know that Pherozeshah Mehta, Budruddin Tyabji, W.C. Bonnerjee and Manmohan Ghose, the Presidents of the Indian National Congress in its early days, received their apprenticeship under Dadabhai Naoroji, in his "London Indian Society."[77] The latter day Congress workers were drawn from the student volunteers who received their political education as volunteers in the early sessions of the Indian National Congress.[78] Thus the Congress served as a forum for the new generation to meet and converse and gather knowledge from the experience of the older generation. The agitation for holding Indian Civil Service examination simultaneously in India and England, under the auspices of the Indian National Congress in the 1880s, gave the students the maiden opportunity to take issues with the government. This also gave them an opportunity to work with Congress to fight on an all India basis[79] and they began to grow along with the Congress in their agitational campaigns.

Recalling his college days in the eighteen seventies Bipin Chandra Pal spoke thus: "The students lived a more or less isolated intellectual and moral life in this country. Our fathers were interested in things that made little or no appeal to us. Our schools and colleges had then an atmosphere of their own, different from that of our caste or community."[80] Then he compared this with the state of things as seen in 1916. According to him free, frequent and bitter discussion on public matters was held in every home where ladies also took an active part in them. B.C. Pal identified the cause of the unrest with the "result of the repression of a healthy and natural desire of the new generation in India to be in their country what every civilised people are in theirs."[81]

The restlessness of the students and their bitterness towards the lack of statesmanly wisdom on the part of the authorities in handling their problems by prosecution, persecution, internment and segregation, were not confined to a single province but was a widespread phenomenon in all the academic centres of the country. Failure on the part of the government to diagnose the disease, and cure the revolutionary proclivity by the removal of the causes of national conflicts, racial segregation and assurance of Home Rule, spelt change. That destined the evolution of the student community into a historic opposition to the British Government. Student power, that strove to reshape the present and illuminate the future, under extraordinary political conditions, was found expanding into a devastating fire. No wonder, the nationalist leaders turned it into a sacred fire at the altar of the country's freedom.

Notes and References

1. Education and Unrest, *Modern Review*, August 1908, pp. 176-77.
2. *Ibid.*
3. For the growth and development of education under the British see Bruce McCully, *English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism.*
4. Earl of Ronaldshay, *The Heart of Aryavarta*, p. 45.
5. Christine R. Dobbin, *Basic Documents in the Development of Modern India and Pakistan*, 1835-1947, p.18.
6. Sir Reginald Coupland, *India A Restatement*, p. 87.
7. Dietmar Rothermund, *The Phase of Indian Nationalism and other Essays*, pp. 17-18.
8. For a brief account of Louis Vivian D'Rozio see K.K. Datta, *Dawn of Renascent India*, pp. 27-32.
9. Annie Besant, *How India Wrought for Freedom*, pp. i-vi.

10. Professor Oaten was the offender in this incident while some students leaving the Kistny class passed his classroom, he came out into the passage and pushed them about throwing down some. Instead of reprimanding the Professor, Principal James took action against the students.
11. Calcutta Presidency College – Report of Committee of Enquiry, *New India*, 18, 25 and 29 May 1916.
12. *Ibid.*, 10 July 1915.
13. Lajpat Rai, *England's Debt to India*, p. 196. Also see Appendix I.
14. The facts taken from the quinquennial report of the Government of India published in 1912 speak for themselves. Facts and figures about Education:

    Total population in India: 315, 156, 386.

    Population of British India: 244, 267, 542.

    School enrolment for 1912: 6, 781, 000.

    The population of India of school age has been calculated as 15%. The actual time spent under primary instruction is three to eight years. This period, however, can not be taken as sufficient results. The primary course, ordinarily occupies from five to six years, the average age of school life is from the completion of the fifth to the end of the eleventh or twelfth year. These ages include 13.7 per cent of the population, if we reckon to the end of the eleventh year, and just below 16 per cent, if we reckon to the end of the twelfth year. On the assumption of 15 per cent of that number are now at school, at the end of 1912.

Total expenditure on education in 1912	£	5,239,507
Amount expended on education from Public funds just one-half the total	£	2,700,000
Number of Universities in India in 1912		5
Two have been addd since that time, making a total of		7
Number of colleges affiliated to the Universities		179
Number of students in colleges		36,533
Expenditure on University education	£	90,000

    One hundred and twenty-three of the hundred and seventy-nine colleges in India are those in which purely arts courses are given; the number of students registered for arts course 28,196. The number has risen by 10,000 in the quinquennium.
    Source: *Ibid.*
15. *Collection of Despatches on Education*, 1854-68.
16. *New India*, 11 August 1916.

    In the Resolution it was assured that "it has never been part of the policy of the Government to substitute the English language for the vernacular dialects of the country", though "it is true that the commercial value which a knowledge of English commands, and the fact that the final examinations of the high schools are conducted in English, causes the secondary schools to be subjected to a certain pressure to introduce prematurely both the teaching of English as a language and its use as the medium of instruction, while for the same reasons, the study of the vernacular in these schools is liable to be corrected in the interest of sound education".

17. *Ibid.*, 18 July 1916.
    In the course of his presidential address at the Bihari Students Conference held on 2 October 1916, Professor Jadunatha Sircar said, "an Indian college student has to work at high pressure if he is to pass". He recalled his days at the college when a B.A. student had to answer only six papers. Later, a graduate was expected to have a deeper knowledge not only of one subject but also of more subjects or their parts. Mastering of subjects in an alien language taxed the powers of the students with burdens and anxieties beyond their endurance. The system of examination required a pass in every paper, and if a man passed in all except one paper he was doomed to rewrite the whole examination year after year, as he was not permitted to appear only for the subjects in which he failed. Overwork and the strains thereby caused in the preparation for an examination, which were greatly responsible for the stiffness of the results, proved to be very cruel to many hardworking students. Ranade discerned this to be one of the chief causes of excessive mortality.
    See Editorial, *Ibid.*, 2 October 1916.
18. Editorial, *Ibid.*, 15 July 1915.
19. *Ibid.*, For a survey of the defects in the English education see V.K. Saxena, *Indian Reaction to British Policies,* pp. 61-76.
20. "Contemporary opinion", Quoted in *New India,* 3 February 1916.
21. Sir Rabindranath Tagore, "Indian Students and Western Teachers", *Modern Review*, April 1916, p. 418.
22. Editorial, *New India*, 4 April 1916.
23. Editorial, *Ibid.*, 24 March 1916.
24. Editorial, *Ibid.*, 4 April 1916.
25. Circular from the Hon'ble Sir Harold Stuart to all local Governments, Home, Pol(A), March 1910, Proc. No. 42, NAI.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.*
29. Letter from J.D.W. Sewel to the Director of Public Instruction (DPI), G.O. No. 53, Education Department, Confidential, 31 January 1911, TNA.
30. Letter from Skinner to DPI, *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*
33. Letter from A.F. Gardiner to the DPI, *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*
35. Letter form Ramanujachari to the DPI, *Ibid.*
36. Letter from A.F. Gardiner to the DPI, *Ibid.*
37. Letter from P.P. Bratthwaite to the DPI, *Ibid.*
38. Letter from Rev. Skinner to the DPI, *Ibid.*
39. Rabindranath Tagore, *loc.cit.*, p. 418.
40. Quoted in *New India*, 18 March 1915.
41. Some idea of the problem can be gathered from the following figures:

	1921-22	1931-32
Number of scholars receiving university education in Arts and Science colleges	48, 933	81,010
Number of scholars receiving University		

education in Professional colleges	13,662	18,483
Number of students in High and Middle Schools	1,239,524	2,297,579
Number of students in special schools receiving technical and professional education	132,706	271,094

Source : Middle class unemployment in India, *Modern Review*, February 1943, p. 145.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 146.
43. Editorial, *New India*, 3 July 1915.
44. *Ibid.*, 3 November 1916.
45. *Ibid.*
46. *Ibid.*
47. *Ibid.*
48. Letter from P.P. Bratthwaite to the DPI, G.O. No. 53, Education, Confidential, 31 January 1911, TNA.
49. *Ibid.*
50. MNNR, *Swadesamitram*, 4 August 1919.
51. *New India*, 17 March 1916.
52. Monier Williams, *Modern India and the Indians*, p. 288.
53. It was doubted if the educated among the non-Brahmins and members of the depressed-classes formed one per cent. See MNNR, *Andhraprakasika*, 7 June 1917.
54. T.K. Ravindran, *Vaikkam Satyagraha and Gandhi*, p. 21.
55. Sukhbir Choudhary, *Growth of Nationalism in India*, Vol. I, p. 471.
56. Harvey G. Kabschull (Ed.), *The Politics in Transitional Societies*, p. 174.
57. Marguerite Ross Barnett, *The Politics of Cultural Nationalism in South India*, p. 22.
58. *University College Calendar*, Trivandrum, 1969-70, p. 22., Vadayil Sadasivan, *Oru Swathanthriya Samarasenaniyudey Katha*, (M.), pp. 25-26.
59. B. Kuppuswamy, *Social Change in India*, p. 136.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 266.
61. *Ibid.*, 27 July 1916.
62. Also see R. Suntharalingam, *Politics and Nationalist Awakening in South India.*
63. *New India*, 16 August 1916; MNNR, *Lokopakari*, 31 July 1916.
64. Rabindranath Tagore, *loc,. cit.*, p. 418.
65. Editorial, *New India*, 18 February 1918.
66. *New India*, 11 October 1919.
67. *Ibid.*
68. *Ibid.*
69. Rabindranath Tagore, *loc cit.*, p. 417.
70. D.G. Karve & D.V. Ambekar (Ed.), *Speeches and Writings of Gopala Krishna Gokhale*, Vol. III, p. 191.
71. K.M. Panikkar, *Asia and Western Dominance*, p. 332; Also see *The Foundations of New India*, p. 120.
72. Anil Seal, *The Emergence of Indian Nationalism, Competition and Collaboration in the later Nineteenth Century*, p. 196.
73. *Ibid.*
74. See Jim Masselos, *Towards Nationalism.*

75. S.R. Mehrotra, *The Emergence of the Indian National Congress*, pp. 288-89.
76. Regional Records Survey Committee (Pub.), *The History of Freedom Movement in Kerala*, Vol. I, p. 77.
77. This Society was organised by Dadabhai Naoroji by binding together Indian students in London who went there to qualify either for bar or for the Indian Civil Service.
78. See Amvika Charan Mazumdar, *The Indian National Evolution*, pp. 204-207.
79. Philip G. Altabach, *Student Politics in Bombay*, p. 57.
80. *New India*, 25 May 1916.
81. *Ibid.*

Chapter 2

Beginnings of Student Movement : The Swadeshi Movement

SWADESHI, literally means, of one's own country and economic in content. Swadeshi movement was protectionist movement in origin. But its development into a many-sided movement synchronised with the partition of Bengal, a political decision taken in 1905, in complete disregard of public opinion. This measure, taken on the specious argument of administrative and service efficiency, inflicted a deep wound in the national psyche of Bengal, a politically sensitive area in India. The student community in Bengal rose equal to the occasion and grew along with the movement. Their brethren in the rest of India equally responded to the call. The existing educational system served them as a base. The government failed to diagnose the symptoms and virtually they lost the case . The nationalists stepped in and became the advocates of the student community.

The resolution partitioning Bengal was received by the Bengali nationalists, at first, with grief rather than with anger. It gave a rude shock to the constitutional methods of political agitation. The signs of transition in the agitational methods as well as in the aim of the national movement began to manifest themselves in the innumerable protest meetings held in the wake of the announcement of July 1905. The student community too joined this process. A meeting of the students of the Government Hindu Eden Hostel held on July 30, ruled out active resistance as a policy impossible and alien to the Bengali nature. As an alternative, they adopted a resolution to boycott European goods. Till the mammoth meeting held in the Calcutta Town Hall on 7 August, the course of public reaction in Bengal was rather mild. Circulation of innumerable leaflets addressed to the pleaders and students in connection with the meeting indicated the change in the trend. It acquired momentum since August 7, when Calcutta witnessed several public meetings thronged by large numbers of students. As a result of these meetings and the secret consultations held between the leaders of the agitation, picketing and boycott of foreign goods were started, which

assumed an aggressive form towards the end of August. The students enthusiastically participated in public meetings, processions, bonfire of foreign cloths, picketing, lecturing and singing of patriotic songs.[1]

The prominent part played by students in the Swadeshi movement served to caution the government. H.H. Risely pointed out that the employment of students as the chief promoters of political agitation, as a legitimate and necessary part of their education, led to the "absolute demoralisation of the students and school masters throughout the country."[2] In their effort to delink the student community from the political agitation, the government formulated principles for the Education Department for dealing with political agitations involving teachers and students in schools and colleges in the name of protecting educational institutions from political danger. The Bengal Government issued a circular on 10 October 1905, which came to be known as the "Carlyle Circular" instructing the District Magistrates and Collectors to take stern measures against political activities by students. It condemned the use of schoolboys and students for political purposes as absolutely subversive, and called upon teachers to prevent boys from taking part in political activities. Withdrawal of the right of competing for government scholarships was prescribed as a penalty for disobedience.[3] The District Officers were asked to report to the heads of schools and colleges names of boys who took part in the Swadeshi movement. The managing committees were invited to call upon the offending teachers to resign or, in default, to dismiss them on pain of losing their right to send up boys for government scholarships. Sir Bampfylde Fuller, Lieutenant Governor of East Bengal issued another circular to the Commissioners, which supplemented the Carlyle Circular. In his crusade against the students, he suppressed public meetings and employed military police.[4] No wonder the Sedition Committee admitted the fact that revolutionaries made capital out of the anti-British feeling, generated by the government interference with the legitimate movements like Swadeshi and by other grievances.[5]

With the publication of the Carlyle Circular by the *Statesman* on 22 October, the next phase of the agitation was started.[6] The Circular sent a paroxysm of excitement among students who were called upon by Bipin Chandra Pal to boycott all government educational institutions and join a "National University." The scheme of a 'National University', free from government control, which would impart education to the national requirements and award degrees, fired the

imagination of the students. This spurred them into activities. Later, when, Surendranath Bannerjee returned to Calcutta, he supported the National University proposal but advised students to go back to the colleges. This caused a temporary split in the student community. But it soon became evident that the students preferred an adventurous policy as envisaged by Bipin Chandra Pal.

The East Bengal Government issued two circulars in November, simllar to the Carlyle Circular, which called upon the managers of colleges and schools to discourage students and schoolboys from attending political meetings and taking part in political processions and the like, and prescribed the penalties for disobedience.[7] This circular, which came to be known as the 'Lyon Circular', marked a high watermark of repression, and the resistance against repression marked a new turning point in the history of Indian national movement.[8] The first blow of the circular fell on Rangpur, when, A.K. Ghose, the Headmaster of the Rangpur Zilla School, issued a circular on 21 October 1905, which prohibited students from taking part in political agitations "on pain of severe disciplinary action."

The government persecution of the boys resulted in the immediate establishment of a permanent body called the Anti-Circular Society, to fight the Carlyle Circular.[9] Its object was to increase the association of students in the various activities of Swadeshi movement and to provide the victims of the Circular with facilities of education. The citizens' response to the challenge of the Carlyle Circular was the establishment of the national school started at Rangpur on 8 November 1905, to impart education on national lines, to those who came away from the official institutions.[10]

The anti-partition agitation which took the form of Swadeshi movement assumed large proportions in Bengal, thanks to governmental repression. Soon its impact was felt outside Bengal. As in other presidencies, the partition of Bengal evoked sympathetic response in the Madras presidency. *Swadeshamitram* wrote that the decision of the Secretary of State was to axe off the unity of Bengal.[11] This trend was followed by the other Madras journals. In September 1905, two thousand printed leaflets were circulated among students, exhorting them to attend a meeting on the beach. Threee thousand students attended this meeting, which was presided over by G. Subramonia Iyer. Resolutions passed on that occasion sympathised with the Bengalis and congratulated the renascent 'Young Bengal'. In that month the boycott

movement was launched in Tuticorin under the leadership of Ramakrishna Iyer. A national fund scheme was launched in 1905 to finance deserving students and indigent enterpreneurs to go to England for scientific and technical studies.[12] Collections for the fund were made at public meetings. Apart from this, students and volunteers were engaged in house-to-house collection. Subramonia Iyer toured the whole of the presidency on behalf of the national fund. As in Bengal, extremists throughout India made their appeals to students.[13] Bipin Chandra Pal became its harbinger in the south.[14]

The student population of the Madras presidency showed no evidences of disloyalty, but, Duncan, the DPI, noticed in 1899 that in the forums of their societies, often, there echoed, "a good deal of misstatements of facts, illogical inferences and ventilation of crude ideas regarding men and things, Government included."[15] He ruled out the methods of repression and prohibition used against their participation in political meetings and discussions. But he considered it to be the duty of the teachers to train them up as good citizens by justifying their opinions, by "substituting clear and full and accurate information for inexact and partial knowledge to show the fallaciousness of the reasoning."[16] This was at a time when many thought that a subject-nation should have no politics and politics was tabooed as a part of a student's education. But the events that followed proved that the enthusiastic political evangelists were better than the professors in correcting their views in regard to the government and justified the debating societies to be a better field for the political emancipation of India. 'The Young Bengal', 'Athenaeum', 'Society for the Promotion of National Feeling', 'Anusilan Samiti', 'Students' Association', and 'Students' Scientific and Literary Society' were some of the leading organisations which inculcated in the minds of the students the fundamentals of political consciousness and patriotism whereas 'Brati Samiti', 'Bande Mataram', 'Sanatan Sampradaya' and the 'Dawn Society' preached the Swadeshi cult to the students of Bengal.[17] In the Madras presidency, the Students' Literary Association, the Young Men's Hindu Association, the Nellore Progressive Union, the Young Men's Association at Dindigul, the Bala Bharath Samiti in Rajahmundry and the Swadesha Vastu Pracharini Sabha were similar organisations.

The Students' Literary Association was formed at Coimbatore in 1886 to encourage the study and discussion of public questions by students.[18] The Young Men's Hindu Association, established in 1903,

was located in the Salem *agraharam*. Though started as a reading room, later the association encouraged the Swadeshi movement. Vakils and students mostly constituted its members numbering nearly 80, and its influence over the student population was great. The Nellore Progressive Union, established in 1907, and housed in Nallappa Reddi Subha Reddi's house, started functioning as a free reading room. Papers such as the *Bande Mataram* and *Amrita Bazar Patrika* were subscribed. The students were encouraged "to read them and take interest in the Swadeshi movement."[19] The Young Men's Association, located at Dindigul town in Madurai district, was established in March 1907. The Association encouraged the Swadeshi movement and the boycott of foreign cloth.

The organisation which fostered feelings of 'Swadeshi' among the students of Rajahmundry was the Bala Bharath Samiti. It was patronised by local vakils. Many students were its members. Parading the town in procession, shouting 'Bande Mataram', demonstrating the virtues of "economic swadeshi", and wearing the Bande Mataram badge were some of the features of this Samiti. Wearing of Bande Mataram pendants was considered to be an act of homage to mother India. But the Europeans were harrassed even at the utterance of the word. Several Europeans, by mistaking the meaning of the word, were annoyed, when they came across processions of students shouting Bande Mataram. But the authorities of the Madras colleges and the manager of the Mission High School, connived at the practice of students wearing this locket. Hunter, the Principal of the Rajahmundry College, was much confounded at this. He thought that by wearing these badges the students disrespected their teachers in displaying their patriotism. Addressing the students on 19 March, he declared that while the students were at liberty to discuss public questions among themselves and attend public meetings, he was against their taking part in public meetings and demonstrations. He threatened his students with instant expulsion for their "rowdy behaviour in the streets." He further made it clear that the "demonstrations plainly directed against Government and English people were obviously intolerable in students of colleges maintained or supported by Government."[20] He prohibited the students on the ground that "agitation was detrimental to studies and discipline." He banned the association of students with the Bala Bharat Samiti, street demonstrations and the wearing of lockets. The first note of dissent against the

order came from J. Ramachandra Rao, a senior B.A. student who, accompanied by one Ganeswara Rao, a member of the Samiti, persuaded the students to defy the orders and participate in the activities of the Samiti. The Principal suspended him and on 'unconditional submission' he was later readmitted.[21]

Ever since the readmission of J. Ramachandra Rao on 26 March the students were closing the ranks. Though the college premises presented an appearance of the return of normalcy, outside, issues that cropped up since the prohibition order were the subject of heated discussions. Students who were suspended were induced to resist authority, and others to revolt, in the event of repressive measures leading to expulsion.[22] The disciplinary order, coupled with the aforesaid efforts kept the powder dry, leading the affairs only to an explosion, when B.C. Pal visited Rajahmundry, thus shattering the hopes of the Principal to bring the students to submission. The sense of nationalism, which would otherwise have been nipped in the bud, began to sprout afresh at the visit of B.C. Pal who carried with him, the mind of the student community. The students associated with Bala Bharat Samiti became very active during Pal's visit. They gave a rousing welcome to Pal, listened to his lectures in large numbers, frequented his residence and sought his advice.

The credit for sowing the seeds of militant nationalism in the soil of the Madras presidency goes to this Bengali agitator. In his brief lecture tour from 11 April to 12 May 1907, he addressed several meetings from Vizagapatam to Madras in the south.[23] During this period, Pal visited many places in response to the invitation tendered by the students. Pal was given largescale receptions at the railway stations and the students took him to the venues of meetings in procession, amidst shouts of Bandemataram, while Bandemataram banners, flags and lockets were widely displayed. In many places, students took the initiative to collect funds to meet the expenses of Pal's visit.

Pal's visit to Madras was fixed for 27 April, but was later postponed to the 30th. On the evening of 30 April, Pal arrived at Madras and was received by G. Subramonia Iyer, Subramonia Bharati, V. Chakkarai Chetti and a host of students. The students insisted on their pulling the carriage in which Pal travelled, but abandoned the idea when Pal disapproved of it. He was taken in procession to his residence at Royapettah, by a host of students estimated at 4,000. The students of Madras presented him with an address which hailed the presence of

Pal in their midst as "an epoch in the political life of the Carnatic." The text of the address was proof of his personal and magnetic impact on the student population. It read: "You come to us an exponent of the new thought which, we believe, is destined to transform the life of the nation."[24]

It was at a time when spokesmen of the public dared to speak in open about 'Swaraj' that Pal electrified the Indian political thought with the exposition of the concept of Swaraj. It surprised many Europeans particularly by its impact on the rising generation. At one time the government thought of arresting Pal under the Regulation of 1819 and dump him back to Calcutta never allowing him to stump back to Madras.[25] The Madras Government favoured his deportation by the Government of India on account of the "seditious" utterances that he made in Bengal.

The firebrand of Bengal that Pal was, his mission in the south was the propagation of the gospel of Swaraj. The content of all his speeches was an explanation of Swaraj and the method of attaining the same. In one of his speeches at Madras on 2 May, Pal remarked that self-government under the British paramountcy, propounded by Dadabhai Naoroji as the goal of the Congress, was an impossible one. He reiterated his concept to make the Government of India autonomous, *absolutely free of the British control.*[26]

Pal's propaganda was almost confined to the middle class, which included vakils, government officials, students and other educated men. His lectures were printed in book form and were circulated in the entire presidency. The vacation for the high court and the educational institutions, which followed the visit of Pal, enabled his adherents to carry with them his teachings to the villages. The newspapers too broadcast the gospel of the new movement. To a large extent some of the incidents that occurred since then were traced to the "evil effects" of Pal's lectures.

In one of his lectures on "national education", Pal declared that all native servants of government were treacherous slaves who had betrayed their country, that all advice by such people was to be distrusted, and that the college discipline, when it clashed with what he styled duty to one's country, was nonsense. The influence of Pal's thought on students was his great hit. This was much evident in the marked differences in tone of the public address read to Pal by Hari Sarvothama Rao,[27] on his arrival on 19 April, and on 24 April, the day

of his departure. The latter address emphasised faith in Swaraj, defined by Pal as complete independence, and adherence to methods of general boycott in achieving the same. The events were soon to assume epic proportions. The students gathered at a meeting and resolved to defy the disciplinary orders. As a first step they attended the college on 24 April, wearing 'Bande Mataram' medals and paper badges. On entering his lecture-room, the Principal found the forbidden locket in profuse use. After some hesitation, the Principal said that his order to remove the badges was obeyed. In a conversation with C. Sankaran Nair, the Advocate General, the students of Rajahmundry were reported to have said that Hunter, in a peremptory and excited manner, "ordered the students to remove the lockets before he finished calling out one, two, three and pushed them out by his own hand."[28] On his entering the second lecture-room, someone cried 'Bande Mataram'; it was a signal for others from all parts of the college. In the commotion that ensued, the Principal seized a student in order to hasten his exit from the scene, and later regretted that his exasperation provoked him to an undignified action.[29] Before the college closed for the vacation on the evening of 26 April, 171 students out of 222 were suspended, of whom 42 were later readmitted. J. Ramachandra Rao was expelled.[30]

The students submitted a memorandum to the DPI and the government, and prayed for justice. After careful enquiry the government issued orders punishing the students in various degrees[31] and patted the Principal for handling the whole situation with "patience, discretion and forbearance", and for the punishment he inflicted upon the students "thoroughly justified in the interests of discipline which it was necessary to uphold."[32]

The whole episode was heatedly discussed in the 'native' newspapers. They made it clear that under the cover of catchwords like 'interest of discipline' and 'maintenance of order', the Principal illegally interfered with the private life and conduct of the students. The *Indian Patriot* remarked that "if it were Mr. Metcalfe or any other Principal, they would not have cared two straws for the wearing of lockets, and would have looked down upon the whole thing with contemptuous silence and even if matters were pushed to a head they would have suppressed the whole thing by their personal influence and the affair would not have been allowed to reach the ears of Government."[33] The punishment meted out to the students was condemned, to be "out of all proportion to the offence alleged to have been

committed by them... and the public have been shown how the giant's strength of a Government can crush the flies that gather on the wheels of a Government machine..."[34] However, another paper predicted that like Babu Surendranath who, when dismissed from Indian Civil Service, rendered yeoman service to the nation, so many Babus would arise from the 130 students rusticated by the government.[35] The core of the issue was that the stronger the resistance by the students to Hunter's compulsion to remove the lockets the more they were compelled to dissociate themselves from the college. *Krishnapatrika* appraised that though they did not favour students taking active part in politics at the expense of their education, they suggested the renunciation of education if it should preclude any one from cherishing patriotism.[36]

Swadeshi feeling among the students in Rajahmundry was commendable. The ban on their participating in political meeting did not stop them from holding private meetings. Virasalingam Library was another place for their private meeting. Some students arranged orally, secret meetings in their own houses, in turn.[37]

Those who disobeyed the orders had no other alternative than to leave the college. Outside the college they strengthened their cause by other means. A good many of the students spread the gospel of Swadeshi and boycott among the villagers.[38] This was quite evident in Ramachandrapur Taluk of Godavari. At Tapeswaram village, Venkatachari, Rangachari and Moda Rangam took to lecturing for one year. Whereas Venkatachari rejoined the college, Moda Rangam, a rich boy, discontiued his studies and Rangachari took to telegraphy.

After their expulsion from their college Ramakrishnaiyah, Godapalli Seetharamaiyah and his uncle's son Venkatramaiyah and T. Ramachandra Rao discontinued their studies and devoted themselves to furthering the cause of Swadeshi movement in a variety of ways. Ramakrishnaiyah sought asylum in the house of his brother at Mandapet and engaged himself in propagating a newly invented handloom called 'swadeshi loom' priced Rs. 7.[39] Godapalli Seetharamaiyah of Mandapet started a reading room where *Bandemataram* and *Amrita Bazar Patrika* were circulated. This student along with Venkataramaiyah, and Bodi Narayana Rao held secret political meetings at the house of Jagamaiyah Sastri.[40] T. Ramachandra Rao was a B.A. student when he was expelled. Since then he opened a Swadeshi shop at Peddapuram, which. flourished under the patronage of the local people.[41]

The return of Indian students from Japan and London trained in small industries, mercantile business and law, was another factor that contributed to the Swadeshi cause. Some of them started factories to produce matches, candles, soaps, pins and calico. Swadeshi spirit among the students was also commendable.[42]

In Madras city, meetings were held daily at the Moore Market which, at times, ended in a procession to the beach. Students who attended them in large numbers hooted at European passers-by with shouts of Bande Mataram. The Madras University, at a special meeting of the senate held on 2 August 1907, decided to punish the students "for misconduct in any Government college or hostel by their exclusion from any University examination, either permanently or for a specified period, or by deprivation of any University scholarship of endowment held by such person or by both".[43] The students retaliated by disturbing the educational exhibition that was held at the senate house on 30 August. The students stoned the windows, then moved to the police station and attacked the same. For this Nataswaram Pillai, a student, was convicted and fined Rs. 25.[44]

When the government with the help of executive orders tried to condition the Indian students they had either to obey or ignore them. When the government orders tried to take away the liberty enjoyed by the Indian students, they wanted to keep aloof in such a way as the orders might not apply to them. The government issued the orders because it believed that the Indians were incapable of managing their own educational institutions. It was the desire of self-respecting school managers, schoolmasters and boys to make the prohibitory orders inapplicable to them and disprove the supposition of the government that Indians could not manage educational institutions. In this, the idea of national education found an auspicious source of strength.

The failure of the bureaucracy to realise and appreciate the Indian views on the educational question kindled a spark which became a wild fire in the wake of the unpopular partition of Bengal. One of the unintended results of the partition was the participation of the students, on an unprecedented scale, in promoting boycott and Swadeshi movement. The indiscriminate disciplinary measures taken by the government to suppress the nascent national consciousness of the student population produced a storm of indignation in the country. Expulsion, dismissal and fining of certain boys and withdrawal of grant or the removal of a school to another site, were carried out by the

authorities as measures against participation in the Swadeshi movement.[45] The rash measures of the government earned the official educational institutions the name "Golamkhana."[46] As the students responded to their leaders and boycotted educational institutions in large numbers, it became imperative for the nationalist leaders to provide them alternative educational institutions. The government circular followed by a policy of repression, the setting up of an Anti-Circular Society, and the storm of protest that followed made the formation of national institutions inevitable. This need was recognised by the Indian National Congress when it resolved at the Calcutta session (1906) that "in the opinion of this Congress the time has arrived for the people all over the country to take up the question of national education, literacy, scientific, and technical, suited to the requirements of the country on national lines under national control."[47] Bengalis took it as a challenge to protect the students from the onslaught of the government and started a National Council of Education on 14 August 1906, to spearhead a system of education on national lines. To start with the 'Bengal National College' was founded, to be followed by the formation of 11 high schools in Bengal and 40 in East Bengal under its auspices. This inspired the nationalists outside Bengal. The Madras presidency was soon found moving on the same lines. The first note was struck when many students were expelled from the Rajahmundry college after their encounter with Hunter.

The difficulties of the student community, it was explained, would not have occurred if there had been national schools.[48] When the people gradually recovered from the stunning effect of the Government Order, they began to devise means to counteract the same. Rather it gave an unprecedented opportunity for the protagonists of national education to work for a scheme of national institutions. The people of Rajahmundry were told about the successful working of these institutions by B.C. Pal, who urged the students to emulate their counterparts in Bengal who boycotted the alien institutions wholeheartedly in favour of the Swadeshi movement.

Speaking on national education Pal said that English education served to humiliate Indians and slacken the improvement of their social and political conditions. The remedy that he suggested was the establishment of national colleges where "national education conducted on national lines and aimed at a national destiny should be imparted to the students."[49] He proposed the formation of a committee and a fund

for the purpose. With Ramachandra Rao as President, a committee was formed on the spot. Students, pleaders and merchants who were present promised monthly instalments, in addition to a lumpsum collection of Rs. 3,000 made on the spot. The estimated amount for the opening of a national college was Rs. 2 lakhs. A number of volunteers were employed to beg for money from the pilgrims on visit to festivals. They were instructed to say "Bavathi Bicham Thegi" (I beg alms in the name of God).[50] The fund for the national college swelled to Rs. 75,000. But it was said that the arrest of Hari Sarvothama Rao gave a rude shock to the national college scheme.[51]

The extremists in Madras convened a meeting on the Madras beach on 6 December to elect delegates to the Surat Congress. This was presided over by V.O. Chidambaram Pillai. In his concluding speech Chidambaram Pillai remarked, "Swaraj could be achieved only by promoting national education and indigenous industries and establishing arbitration courts all over the country, and that the more these were encouraged the less would be left for the British to do in India."[52] This was the substance of the prevailing extremist thought and the content of many of Pillai's speeches made during that period. A resolution passed at that meetting favoured educational institutions on national lines and national control, and urged the Congress to organise a national council of education on the Bengal model. Chidambaram Pillai exhorted audiences "not to send their children for University education but to give primary education, until Swadeshi schools were opened."[53] In spite of considerable propaganda work the Madras presidency could draw little enthusiasm compared with that of Bengal. Still it could take pride in founding the secondary national school at Rajahmundry in January 1908, the model national school at Masulipatam in July 1909 and the Andhra Jateeya Vidya Parishad. The reasons for the inherent weakness of the national education movements were not far to seek. This was more obvious from the turnout in a public meeting called by the provisional committee, which was formed under the auspices of Pal, to consider the question of establishing a national school. The meeting was held from 15 July 1907 under the presidency of Vedavaram Prasada Rao Pantulu for three days. A resolution read out by the Secretary Hari Sarvothama Rao was adopted by the meeting, with the exception of five or six persons.[54] The sponsors could get together only 30 to 40 persons for discussing such an important subject. It was curious that the students turned out in

large numbers. Most of the prominent members of Rajahmundry were conspicuous by their absence. They were either hardly interested to come out of their individual world to take interest in public life or afraid of displeasing the authorities who were suspicious of the new movement.[55] The zamindars and the rich landlords were not expected to have a soft corner for the movement. Hence the success depended more on the efforts of the protagonists of the movement to combine the co-operation of the educated and middle class people by convincing them that the movement was nothing treasonable, and that its success was inevitable to the cause of freedom.

Terrorist movement in Madras presidency, unlike in Bengal, the Punjab and Maharashtra, was only sporadic. Some of the terroristic occurrences since 1907 were the Tuticorin bomb outrage in 1907, the Kakinada riot on 31 May 1907, some minor assault upon Europeans during the visit and after the departure of B.C. Pal, the Tinnevely and Tuticorin riots of March 1908, and the Tenali bomb case in Kistna.[56] The background for the terroristic activities had already been laid by the spread of anti-British feeling roused by Tilak, Lajpat Rai, B.C. Pal and Aurobindo Ghose.

Yugantar in Bengal invited the youth "to murder Englishmen for the overthrow of imperialism, to take a life rather than lay down a life."[57] South Indian students in Calcutta and Bombay, who came under the direct influence of the cult of the bomb, were the pioneers of this movement in the south. They rendered the soil fertile, Pal sowed the seeds, and the seedlings began to sprout out, only to be nipped in the bud.

Circulars in English, forecasting revolution in the immediate future and urging the people to sell all government securities, were found distributed by post from London. A small pamphlet entitled "The Secret Organisation of Russians" containing sixteen pages was also found with some students in Madras city. The copies of pamphlets and leaflets were usually addressed to the monitors of different classes and were chiefly found in Guntur, Kistna and Trichinopoly districts. It was believed that these were despatched by Shyamji Krishnavarma, the editor of the *Indian Sociologist* in London.[58]

There was a minority of youths in Kakinada who believed in the cult of the bomb and justified its throwing at Metcalfe by Khudiram Bose. This attitude became obvious when, R.W.D.E. Ashe, ICS, the then collector of Godavari district, received an anonymous letter posted

from Kakinada town, that a bomb will be thrown at him that night. It was only a ghost letter. The government suspected Vakana Venkayya, a Japan-returned student, as well as all chemistry graduates and people of Kistna and Godavari for the manufacture of bombs. But the threat against his life was carried out when Ashe, later the collector of Tinnevely, arrived at Maniyachi by a train bound to Tuticorin and was shot dead by Vanchi Iyer.[59] The punishment meted out to V.O. Chidambaram Pillai and Ettiraj Arya and others in the south and their innumerable counterparts in the north, struck an unpopular note among the young blood of this presidency. This was constantly fomented by the revolutionary school, which took political asylum in Pondicherry, then a French territory, right under the nose of the presidency. The subscribers to the 'seditious' papers such as *Vijaya, India*, and *Suryodaya* published from Pondicherry, were scattered in the presidency. The task of helping them forge ahead was piloted by Nilakanta Brahmachari,[60] a native of Tanjore district, aged 21. He was the editor of *Suryodaya*, which was later proscribed. His discovery of likeminded men led him to found a new secret society to discuss and carry out his schemes.

At the first gathering of this society held on 10 April 1910, it was planned "to select proper men in every village and town, organise a revolution throughout the country and massacre the white people on the same day." [61] Even before the founding of this society there existed at Shenkottah a secret society, Bharatha Matha Association by name, which fostered the Pondicherry school of thought. Vanchi Iyer [62] was one of its active members. So the meeting of Nilkantan with Vanchi Iyer, a clerk in the Travancore Forest department at that time, proved eventful. For, the plan to murder Ashe was hatched at one of the Society's secret meetings held in April and May, 1911, at Shenkottah. Ashe was singled out as the first foreigner to be killed. The impression that Ashe ruined the Swadeshi Steam Navigation Company, probably influenced them to take this decision. Though the society succeeded in firing its first shot, the bureaucracy unearthed it and gave it a death blow by inflicting various punishments on its fourteen revolutionary leaders.

So far, disciplinary procedure against student activists was hastily taken to meet the local requirements with the help of circulars and letters issued from time to time by provincial authorities, the effect of which was shortlived. In the face of mounting student activism, the supreme government felt that they were losing their ground in the

attempt to keep their hold on the student population and was forced to adopt urgent policies against the drift. The Government of India order of 4 May 1907 was a definite step against this tendency of schoolboys, college students, school masters and college professors to associate themselves with political activities, which was considered to be harmful to both studies and discipline, and was therefore to be prevented.[63] Measures suggested by this order, which came to be known as "Risely Circular", were more akin to the Bombay educational proceedings, Bengal Educational Rules and the Carlyle Circular.[64]

The Risely Circular too proved a desperate attempt on the part of the bureaucracy to assert their hold on the student community far more rigidly than ever in the past. In the words of Sri Aurobindo, an extremist politician of Bengal, who took to spiritualism after the Chittagong bomb raid case, "the Risely Circular, is in reality a powerful attack on the growing spirit of nationalism at its most vital point."[65]

It would be clear from the foregoing that students had a very prominent part in the Swadeshi movement. Surendranath Banerjee was full of pride about their role. He remarked that "their enthusiasm was roused to a pitch such as I had never before witnessed. It was the fervour of the students that communicated itself to the whole community and inspired it with an impulse, the like of which had never been felt before."[66] This was equally applicable to the student community of Madras presidency and elsewhere. They were very quick to understand the situation and elders generated enthusiasm among the students and the students inspired them in return. When the circular was flung against the student community the *Statesman*, a leading English newspaper commented that "Government had blundered apparently into a childish and futile policy which can only have the effect of manufacturing an army of martyrs."[67] The Bande Mataram medals in Rajahmundry blindfolded the authorities to take repressive measures to bring the students into order. But the excitement generated in the minds of students, whether in Madras, Bengal or elsewhere led them to form secret associations and take to anarchical methods. Surendranath Banerjee was awestruck at this development whereas Gokhale admitted that "Youngmen are beginning to ask what was the good of constitutional method if it was only to end in the partition of Bengal."[68] Thus the Swadeshi movement marked a landmark in the struggle for India's freedom and set a pattern for the future political activities.[69]

Notes and References

1. For a detailed account of the role of students of Bengal in the Swadeshi movement see Sumit Sarkar, *The Swadeshi Movement in Bengal*, 1903-1908.
2. Letter from H.H. Risely, Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department to Sir Arthur Godly, His Majesty's Under- secretary of State for India, No. 30, 8 February 1906, Home, Pub. A., June 1906, Proceedings Nos. 169-186, NAI.
3. Circular issued by R.W. Carlyle, Officiating Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal, 10 October 1905, Home, Pub. A., August 1906, Proceedings 261-271, NAI.
4. C. Sankaran Nair, *Autobiography*, p. 303.
5. *Ibid.*
6. See Haridas Mukherjee and Uma Mukherjee, *The Origins of the National Education Movement*, (1905-1910), pp. 21-22.
7. Circular issued by P.C. Lyon, Chief Secretary to the Government of East Bengal and Assam to the Commissioners of Rajasahi, Dacca and Chittagong Division and to all District Officers of the Transferred areas, 16 October 1905, *Parliamentary Papers*, 1906, Vol. LXXXI, 3242.
8. Nemai Sadhan Bose, *Indian Awakening and Bengal*, p. 298.
9. Amales Tripathi, *The Extremist Challenge*, p. 121.
10. For the details of the national education movement in Bengal, see Haridas Mukherjee and Uma Mukerjee, *op. cit.*
11. MNNR. *Swadeshamitram*, 6 July 1905.
12. S.A. Govindarajan, *Kasturi Ranga Iyengar*, p. 44.
13. Nirad C. Chaudhari, *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian*, pp. 48-107.
14. According to Nevinson, the Swadeshi idea received a warm reception in Madras. He said: " 'None but Swadeshi goods', 'Buy our Nationalist cottons', 'Try our Bande Mataram Cigarettes', were the most important advertisements in Newpapers". A.W. Nevinson, *The New Spirit in India*, p. 123.
15. Letter from D. Duncan, the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, to the Secretary to the Government, Educational Department, Madras, 25 November 1889, G.O. No. 345-55, Education Department, June 1899, TNA.
16. *Ibid.*
17. For an account of students' volunteer groups in Bengal, see Aparna Basu, *The Growth of Education and Political Development in India*, 1898-1920, pp. 197-199.
18. *CID Report*, TNA, Vol. IV, p. 676.
19. *Ibid.*
20. Letter from Hunter to the Director of Public Instruction, Coonoor, 3 May 1907, *Bipin Chandra Pal's Speeches*, p. 269, TNA.
21. *Order No. 385.*, Education, 18 June 1908, TNA.
22. . *Bipin Chandra Pal's Speeches*, p. 269, TNA.
23. For a brief account of Bipinchandra at Madras see Prof. Haridas Muk

and Prof. Uma Mukherjee, *Bipin Chandra Pal and Indian Struggle for Swaraj*, pp. 77-85.

24. Address of welcome presented to Bipin Chandra Pal by the students of Madras, *Bipin Chandra Pal's Speeches*, p. 505, TNA.

25. *CID Report*, TNA., Vol. I, p. 13.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 153.

27. For joining anti-British agitation he was debarred from government service for thirty years. He was the first to court arrest in Andhradesa during the Swadeshi Movement. For his fiery editorials against the government in the Swarajya in 1908 he was awarded three years imprisonment; see S.P. Sen, *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. II, pp. 148-150.

28. Copy of a D.O. from C. Sankaran Nair, 4 June 1907 *CID Report*, TNA., Vol. II, p. 55.

29. Letter from Hunter to the Director of Public Instruction, Coonoor, dated 3 May 1907, *Bipin Chandra Pal's Speeches*, p. 277, TNA.

30. Details of the situation can be had from the following statement.

	University Class				Total
	I	*II*	*III*	*IV*	
Strength of Class	67	70	34	51	222
Number absent on 24th April 1907	4	2	3	16*	25
Number suspended	59	65	14	33	171
Number expelled	..	..	..	1	1
Number who did not secede	4	3	17	..	24
Number readmitted or conditionally promised readmission	13	25	4	..	42
Number under suspension on 20th May 1907	46	40	10	33	129

* Mainly students of "Science" subject only who had no examination on 24th April 1907.

Source: Order No. 385, Education, 18 June 1907, TNA.

31. Government resolved :

(*i*) that Hari Sarvothama Rao, M.A. be debarred from employment as a teacher in any Government or aided school or college;

(*ii*) that as to Ramachandra Rao, the Director of Public Instruction be requested to move the Syndicate to debar him altogether from appearing for B.A. Degree that his terms and transfer certificates be refused, and that he be not readmitted into any Government or aided college;

(*iii*) that as to those students of the fourth year class who possess all the term certificates required by the University for any division of the B.A. Degree examination, the Director of Public Instruction be requested

to meet the Syndicate to debar them from appearing for any branch of the B.A. Degree examination for a period of two years. None of the seceding students belonging to this class will be permitted to continue their studies for any branch of the B.A. Degree either in the Rajahmundry college or in any other Government or aided college, and to such of them as do not possess term or transfer certificates, these certificates will be refused;

(*iv*) that the junior students who were under suspension on the 20th May 1907 be expelled, the grant of term and transfer certificates refused to them, and that they be not readmitted into the Rajahmundry college; that as to those of them who are students of the second year class and who possess all the term certificates required by the University for the First in Arts Examination, the Director of Public Instruction be requested to move the Syndicate to debar them from appearing for that examination for the period of one year.

Source: *Ibid.*

32. *Order No. 385*, Education, 18 June 1907, TNA.
33. MNNR., *The Indian Patriot*, 25 July 1907.
34. *Ibid.*
35. *Ibid.*
36. MNNR., *Krishna Patrika*, 28 June 1907.
37. Confidential Report, No. 5, *CID Report*, TNA, Vol. III, p. 93.
38. Confidential Report, No. 3, *Ibid.*, p. 41.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
41. Confidential Report, No. 2, *Ibid.*, p. 37.
42. Confidential Report, Guntur, 24 September 1908, *Ibid.*, pp. 168-169.
43. Diary of Events 1907, *CID Report*, TNA, Vol. IV, p. 76.
44. *Ibid.*
45. Home, Pol., (A) 1909, Nos. 10-11, NAI.
46. House of Manufacturing Slaves.
47. K. Iswara Dutt, *Congress Cyclopaedia*, p. 212; A.M. Zaidi (Ed.), *The Encyclopaedia of Indian National Congress*, Vol. V, p. 155.
48. MNNR., *Andhra Kesari*, 3 May 1907.
49. Note by the Personal Assistant to the Deputy Inspector General of Police for Criminal Intelligence, *CID Report*, TNA, p. 488.
50. Confidential Report 5, *CID Report*, TNA, Vol. III, p. 93.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 69.
52. History Sheet of V.O. Chidambaram Pillai, (Secret) *CID Madras*, 19 June 1909, p. 3, TNA.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
54. MNNR., *Andhra Kesari*, 19 July 1907.
55. MNNR., *The Indian Patriot*, 24 July 1907.

56. In regard to the impact of Bipin Pal's Madras visit see Haridas Mukherjee, *op. cit.*
57. P.K.K. Menon, *The History of Freedom Movement in Kerala*, Vol. II, p. 24.
58. Confidential Reports, *CID Report*, TNA, Vol. II, p. 189.
59. P.K.K. Menon, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 23-30. Also see K.K. Kusuman, *The Extremist Movement in Kerala*, pp. 1-16 and M.G. Indira Devi, *Terrorism in South India.*
60. For an account of Nilakantan see C. Sankaran Nair, "An Episode of Terrorism in South India", *Journal of Kerala Studies*, Vol. V, December 1978, pp. 519-521.
61. P.K.K. Menon, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 26.
62. For an account of Vanchi Iyer see C. Sankaran Nair, *loc. cit.*, pp. 517-519.
63. *Risely Circular*, 4 May 1907, Education (A), June 1907, Proceedings, 76, NAI.
64. In Bombay, they were further supplemented by orders issued in September 1908 and August 1909, and in Bihar and Orissa, by orders issued in September 1914. Meanwhile, the government of the Central Provinces on its order issued on 31 January 1917 extended the instructions of 1907 regarding public meetings, and left it to the masters to decide on the public meetings their boys could attend.
65. "True Meaning of the Risely Circular" in *Sri Aurobindo, Bande Mataram, Early Political Writings*, Vol. I, p. 381.
66. Surendranath Banerjee, *A Nation in Making*, pp. 181-182.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 190.
68. Quoted in R.N. Aggarwala, *National Movements and Constitutional Development of India*, p. 53.
69. Sasadhar Sinha, *Indian Independence in Perspective*, p. 59.

Chapter 3

The Gathering Storm: The Impact of Home Rule Movement on Students

BETWEEN the partition of Bengal and the Minto-Morley Reforms of 1909, extremist movement in India experienced severe treatment at the hands of the British. When the leaders of revolt came out of their goals, they found that most of their groundwork had been undone by the government. In the north, Balagangadhara Tilak attempted to keep the fire of revolution burning, after his release from the Mandalay jail. The transportation of V.O. Chidambaram Pillai and the repression of the Ashe murder conspirators, resulted in the eclipse of extremism in the south. VOC, who was released in 1912, was not at all happy at the turn of events. The Congress, which was divided at Surat in 1907, dominated by the moderates, slowed down its march towards Indian freedom. It was in this context that the First World War broke out in 1914, which offered the freedom fighters an unprecedented opportunity to exact more and more reforms from the British Government. This demanded a union of moderates and extremists to forge ahead under the single banner of the Congress. This union was brought about by Mrs. Annie Besant who aspired for dominion status for India.[1] She came to India in 1893. Her work in this country was in four distinct fields, she was a theosophist, educationalist and a social reformer before she plunged into politics, forced by circumstances. Through her writings and speeches, she made her presence felt in Indian politics, since 1898. "It is possible" she wrote, "that I would have never jumped into political work, had not increasing repression by the authority, narrowing of liberty, the ill-treatment of students and the danger of revoultion forced me into the field."[2] Later, in August 1916 she started the All India Home Rule League to spearhead India's fight for freedom. At a time when she was riding the horse of public opinion, she was able to take along with her the entire student folk. She became the advocate of the student cause and an interpreter of their grievances.

The recollections of K.P.S. Menon, the well-known civil servant and diplomat, who saw the Indian resurgence while a student in Madras,

bear testimony to the overwhelming influence of Mrs. Besant upon the students. Students in large numbers gathered at her meetings. Her methods were simple, and the manner in which she presented her arguments were as remarkable as the matter.[3] No wonder the British Government attributed the cause of student unrest and of several unpleasant incidents which occurred in the Madras presidency since 1914, to the "sedulous diffusion of ideas" through the "unbridled press and platform" handled by Mrs. Besant and her followers. The hold of Mrs. Besant and her followers over the rising generation was an accomplished fact. Regular reading of the newspaper *New India*, perusal of Besant's pamphlets and attendance in Home rule classes and public meetings influenced the student community.

When notices inciting the readers to "kill the English" and to "worship Mrs. Besant" were displayed at St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, and at the Coimbatore College[4], this was attributed to the "evil effect" of Besant's political propaganda. In Trichinopoly, the schoolboys were heard reciting the last sentence of Besant's article on Tilak's security case: "The agony of the cross precedes the resurrection of India—a nation."[5] The influence of her writings was felt even beyond the Madras presidency. The deep interest shown by the students of the Patna College was an instance. The Home rule pamphlets were hot cakes for them. The Lady who wrote the pamphlets was believed to have been invested with something of a halo of glory."[6]

New India on 5 July 1916, published 'a garbled version' of the judgement of a case in Sindh, in which it was stated that the reservation of compartments by railway companies for Europeans was illegal.[7] The editorial comment added, "Such an illegal notice is attached to several trains connected with Madras and we trust its illegality will be remembered by the Indian passengers."[8] Afterwards, this extract was reprinted and issued as a pamphlet by some youths. A correspondent, on a subsequent issue, complained that a station master forced him to get down from a reserved compartment which he had entered. The editorial comment on this was, "Why did you get out? It is this submission to illegality that cause half the troubles from which Indians suffer."[9] Provocative journalistic activities of Mrs. Besant and the issue of the pamphlet, had an immediate effect on the travelling public. Frequent collisions on suburban trains between Indian students and Anglo-Indians culminated, on 27 July 1916, in an affray at the Fort station.[10] The court which tried the case, however, attributed the fracas to the distribution of

the above mentioned leaflet.[11] On 11 September 1916, Sir Sivaswami Ayyar, member of the Executive Council, presided over a meeting in the Presidency College, Madras. The presidential address was interrupted and he was treated in a most insulting manner till the close of the proceedings.[12] The 'unmannerly conduct' of the students was attributed to the impact of *New India* which attacked him repeatedly.

Once the students wrote on the blackboard, "We do not ask for Home Rule; we demand it."[13] Hustling and shouting at police reporters in public meetings became common with the students. At a meeting held in the Pachaiyappa's Hall on 6 November 1916, a policeman was manhandled by students who pricked him with pins and snatched away his cap. The government officials believed that such unseemly disturbances were the consequences of Mrs. Besant's unmeasured condemnation of the CID, which she termed the Crush India Department. A lecture given by Dadabhai Paramanandadas Thakore, on 8 December, was disrupted when it came to be known that "Mr. Arundale, though originally invited to preside, has refused to occupy the chair on learning that the lecturer had on one occasion attacked Mrs. Besant at a meeting."[14] Another attempt to give a further address by Dr. Thakore, entitled "A page out of my public life with special reference to Mrs. Besant and Mr. Arundale", too ended in confusion. The turbulent audience of students numbering over 2,000 refused to hear and the meeting came to a tumultuous close.[15] The chairman's speech was repeatedly interrupted, and his references to Mrs. Besant and Arundale were cheered. His speech was punctuated with much ironical laughter and applause, and, in the disorder, the police had to see the lecturer back home.

The Government of India viewed with grave concern the effect of articles and orations of the Home rule agitators especially on the youthful students and schoolboys whose enthusiasm was enlisted in furtherance of the Home rule campaign. They considered that the young required to be protected from falling a prey to the flattery of the agitators who called them patriots and saviours of the motherland and thereby sowed the seeds of indiscipline and anarchy among them.[16] The government held that the students should be prevented from attending meetings in pursuance of the Home rule campaign and also that the powers available under the Defence of India Act should be invoked against those who tried to delude their judgement and unbalance their unformed mind.[17]

In Madras, the Governor-in-Council felt it urgent to delink students from associating with Besant in the face of her increasing popularity (among students), and so issued G.O. No. 559 as a measure for protecting the students. Mrs. Besant, the doughty champion of the students, became its staunch critic assailing the order as unreasonable and fraught with grave mischief, and warned the government that repression would not check the rising tide of Indian struggle for liberty. Youngmen driven out of the constitutional arena of politics, which they had the right and duty to study and discuss, would turn to anarchical methods. This was the gist of the remark repeated in many of her utterances since the G.O. was published.

Young India was broadly divided into two great bodies; those youngmen who were still in *statu pupillari* and those who had passed that stage – the raw recruits and the trained soldiers. Besant considered that to send men, untrained, indisciplined and ignorant, to the warfront would be like sending sheep to the slaughter house. National rectuits in the service of the motherland, were to undergo preparatory discipline before they could wage war against social injustice, poverty, ignorance, dirt, disease, intemperance, etc. They had to be drilled before they could become "soldiers fit to gain the victory in their manhood, as law-makers, as teachers, as leaders of their country, when they come to man's estate and take up a man's work."[18]

Annie Besant held that "the only enthusiasm useful in the cause of liberty is like the tempered steel; it has been purified in the furnace of discipline, hammered on the anvil of knowledge, poured red-hot into the ice-cold water of drudgery, until it has a strength that naught can break, a resilience that naught can overstrain, a keenness that naught can resist, a flexibility that naught can escape."[19] Then only, she said, they were worthy to go on active service. Raw recruits in the army for political action would do more harm to their own army than to the army of the foe.

With the object of preventing Indian students from drifting towards anarchism under the sinister influence of Shyamji Krishnavarma, a revolutionary abroad, Annie Besant, with the help of some of her followers started the 'Order of the Sons of India,' in 1908, and a little later, that of the 'Daughters of India'. Women, foreign or Indian, who took no part in public life, took a special pledge whereas men students took the 'Son's pledge'. Official approval was sought, to protect the order from the persecution of the lower officials. Lord Minto, the then

Viceroy cordially approved the order as a "movement to rescue youngmen from sedition and the gallows, and to restore the Indian womanhood to its ancient splendour."[20] Deeply impressed by the importance of the work of the order, Sir Aurthur Lawley, the then Governor of Madras became its patron in the Madras presidency. The yellow-scarved lads of the order were trained for social work, and they did yeoman service whenever occasion demanded.

The Order of the Sons and Daughters of India was a method by which Mrs. Besant thought of harnessing the youthful energy for good purposes, ensuring them not to be tempted by anarchical methods. Social work, as proposed in the order, was what Mrs. Besant considered to be the practical politics of the students. Mrs. Besant wanted them to prepare themselves for the citizen's life in manhood "by serving in night schools; by starting and superintending small co-operative societies for relieving the poor from debt, by visiting hospitals and writing letters for convalescents, by visiting the homes of the poor"[21] and in many other ways. These were meant for the students to gather information about the condition of the country.

The initial success of Mrs. Besant in checking the spread of violence, through the reputation and activities of the order, made her a target of attack by parties of violence. This temporarily checked the activities of the order in 1911-14 only to recommence later.

A Lodge of the Sons and Daughters of India was formed at Adyar on 29 August 1915, the objectives of which were "(a) to expand the night school which is working on the Adyar compound and (b) to select a committee to attend to the work of spreading the book, *Wake up, India.*"[22]

Mrs. Besant organised the "Order of the Rising Star" 'for the sake of firmly establishing righteousness' by destroying the wicked and protecting the good people.[23] "The Servants of the Stars," established in 1913, was a junior branch of the order. Its members were aged below twenty-one years and were aspirants to get trained in the special kind of service demanded by the spirit of the new age.[24] The total membership of the servants reached 8,999 in May 1917.[25]

Under the initiative of G.P. Aryaratna, a student of F.G. Pearce, and the Colonial Commissioner of the Baden Powell Boy Scouts Association in Ceylon, the first Scout troop was organised at the Madanapalle College.[26] When affiliation of the troop was sought with the London Headquarters of the Baden Powell Scouts Association, the request was

turned down on the ground that "the number of British officers in the Scout movement in India was insufficient to justify the extension of scouting among Indians during the war."[27] It was regarded as an insult, and Mrs. Besant founded the Indian Boy Scouts Association in 1917 "as a part of the fight for the right of Indians."[28] The Madras Government which looked with suspicion upon Mrs. Besant's Home rule activities, banned the Indian Boy Scouts Association, dubbing it as an anti-British organisation, and installing in its place a government-sponsored organisation.[29]

The growing awareness that the official education was a subtler way of denationalising India, resulted in an upheaval of educational thought in the country. Even in 1882, the educated Indians, conscious of this defect in the official system of education, gave evidence before the Indian Education Commission and stressed the need for religious instruction. The origin of national education, to a large extent, can be traced, to the search for an alternative system of educational curriculum professing a spirit of the Motherland. National education meant such education as would bring about reforms consistent with India's past and current requirements, and to transform Indians into a nation like any other on the face of the earth. Such an education was an impossibility in institutions run by an alien government. It was thought that the educational system should be made nation-oriented in order that it might draw nourishment from the nation's own history and institutions.[30] Such instruction could only be imparted in a national system of education under Indian control. The legacy left by the theosophical movement in India gave a good start in this direction.

Colonel Olcott and Madam Blavatsky, the pioneers of the theosophical movement in India, started schools for the lowest classes in Madras. Madam Blavatsky passed away in London in 1891, and Colonel Olcott in 1897. Before their death, the Olcott Panchama Free School in Madras had a strength of 534 boys and 194 girls.[31] He impressed upon the Madras Government that the influence of theosophical teaching was excellent among the natives, ". . . improving their moral tone, making them more self-reliant and more tractable as subjects."[32]

Mrs. Besant showed considerable interest in the rising generation of India. The opening of schools and colleges was an attempt in this direction. It was with the object of "improving the morals of Hindu students and of engendering a love for Aryan spirituality"[33] that she associated herself with the Sanatan Dharma Paripalana Sabha,[34]

Benares. She worked for an educational system founded on Indian ideals and enriched, not dominated, by the thought and culture of the west.[35] The Benares Hindu College, the Central Girls High School, Benares, the Madanapalle High School and College, and the Adyar National College, were the gains of her crusade for education.[36] The government officials believed that in the Theosophical Society, professing theosophists were slowly manufactured, and they suspected danger in the influence of theosophy-cum-nationalism on Hindu youths.

Mrs. Besant and her followers in the Home Rule League were preoccupied with the task of spreading the idea of national education and collecting funds for starting a National College of Commerce in Madras. The First National University with an elaborate scheme was established at Madanapalle. Sir Rabindranath Tagore, D. (Sir) S. Subramonia Aiyer, Justice Sadasiva Ayyar, G.S. Arundale were its Chancellor, Pro-Chancellor, acting Vice-Chancellor, and Registrar, respectively. Madanapalle was to be the centre for arts and agriculture, Bengal for technology, Bombay for commerce, and Benares for the training of women teachers.[37]

Next to Besant, G.S. Arundale promoted the cause of national education in Madras presidency. He was an educationist in favour of the teaching of civics and of the spirit of patriotism in schools and colleges. Since there can be no right education under an autocracy he had been forced to join the Home Rule League, and he pushed his way through to the position of the Organising Secretary. He considered that the schools and colleges should be miniatures of India.[38] He constrasted the destructive effects of the prevalent irreligious and anti-national system of education, with the system, he worked under and elaborated in the Central Hindu College, Benares.

Through the 'weekly chats' that appeared in the pages of *New India*, he suggested to young men how they had to train themselves in an orderly manner for the service that every citizen owed to his country. One of those 'chats' said that India was passing through the most critical period of her history when she depended largely upon the young India.

Unlike the educational movements launched during the Swadeshi and non-co-operation days, the movement during the Home rule days was noteworthy. Its leaders never advocated boycott of western educational institutions. Instead they attracted students towards them by

imparting knowledge of the east, much against the proselytising trend of the missionary education. Again, they aimed at a happy synthesis of the east and the west on the educational platform. To Mrs. Besant, the ace leader of the movement, the national education movement was not a political tool to arrest the working of the British Government, but was a social measure to inclucate in the youth the spirit of the Motherland. This, they considered, was essential to make them fit for Home rule.

The organisation of independent student bodies to voice forth their grievances to their masters on matters concerning their interest was largely felt by G.S. Arundale.[39] The *raison d'e tre* of students' conferences or conventions or federations was subjected to various misgivings. While some sympathised with the student world, they were in the dark as to the object of bringing together younger scholars to meet in conference. Some believed that these institutions would serve to be the breeding ground for political extremism among the young under the pretext of educational and social activity. A letter to the editor that appeared in *New India* held that the conventions would destroy reverence to elders and the true spirit of studentship in them.[40] In this, the sentiment expressed by Pandit Madan Mohan Malavia is noteworthy. "The students have got their grievances, but an agitation akin to political agitation is not the way to get them removed."[41]

In India, the Bihar Students Conference[42] was the pioneer organisation of the kind, and was rightly called the mother of all Indian student conventions. The organisers made every effort to extend the usefulness of the conference beyond the limits of the official annual meeting. The series of resolutions highlighting the students problems attracted even the notice of the officials.

The need for such an organisation was felt by men like Principal M.J. Roy Strock of the AEIM College, Guntur. He granted the students a senate with a well-framed constitution and class organisations with well-defined powers.[43] The associations were found working satisfactorily and the requests of the students on reasonable grounds were attended to, and their grievances redressed.[44] The students were much impressed by this and they were trained to be citizens of the Empire and to understand the difference between independence and disobedience.

Side by side with this experiment, officially sponsored discussion groups were organised in many colleges under the strict supervision of teachers. But such gatherings were held only to discuss matters related

to their studies. To concern themselves with matters outside the educational sphere was considered to be their first entry into the arena of politics, which the alien government viewed as a dangerous step. But a bold step was taken when organisations such as Bombay Presidency Students' Federation,[45] Northern Circar Students' Conference, Andhra Students' Conference, Madras Students' Convention, Ganjam District Students' Conference, Nellore District Students' Conference, Chittoor-North Arcot Students' Associations, All Orissa Students' Conference, Young Utkal Associations, Malabar Students' Conference, Tinnevely Students' Association and the like sprang up.

In 1916, "a band of youngmen, actuated by the noblest impulses that youth could ever experience, strove hard to found an institution to develop the social qualities and regulate the new-born hopes and impulses of the students of this part of the land.[46] Though the idea of a student organisation had occupied the minds of students for many years, it was only at the end of February 1916, that it became a sanguine desire for its organisers. Many factors forced it to take definite shape. The Muzaffarpore session of the Behari Students' Conference under the presidency of Mrs. Besant can claim to be the largest single factor to set the thinking student community to work for convening the Madras Students' Convention.[47]

Various discontents in the student community urged the need for some organisations which might become the mouthpiece of their aspirations and desires. The new spirit among the students, which was the general trend of the day, served as the capital for the movement. The pioneers of the movement were A.S. Rajam and K. Sanjiva Kamath. They had to surmount various obstacles before they could bring into being the first session of the convention in December 1916.

Even in their nonage, the students in their associations showed admirable functioning. The sessions were styled after the Congress session. The general tone and level of the speeches could compare favourably with those of the conference of elders.[48]

Academicians, public men and government officials were specially invited and they attended the deliberations with keen interest. The president of the session was expected to know about the youth of the country, their problems, aspirations, rights and disabilities. Some of the eminent men to occupy the presidential[49] chair during this period were Dr. (Sir) S. Subramonia Aiyer, Annie Besant, G.S. Arundale, A.G. Gardiner and Prof. Agashe.

Student conferences generally afforded a common platform where questions of general interest to the students were discussed, prevailing conditions of school life reviewed and attempts made to improve them wherever they were bad. The forum also served as a cross-section of India in transition. To a large extent the student conventions generated a genuine spirit of fellowship, co-operation and brotherhood among student from different parts of the country. The creative impulses of the youth remained blurted in the universities and the students' conventions served to supplement this by setting certain aims for them. The Madras Students Convention brought out a monthly magazine, the *New Student*.[50] The idea of forming an all India Students' Convention with the Madras, Bihar, Orissa, and Andhra Students' Association as its nucleus also took birth.

Whereas *New India* groomed the Madras students to take up their responsibilities as citizens after their education, some of the contemporary newspapers decried students' conferences which drew the young students into the thick of national politics.[51] Their questioning loomed large since the students conventions owed its origin and growth to the Home Rule League or to the Theosophical society. Advocates of the European presence in India, as these newspapers were, they took issue with the speech of K.V. Srinivasa Ayyangar, the Chairman of the reception committee of the Madras Students Convention held at Trichinopoly in 1917, that the "Europeans were an alien race who had no business to be here."[52] The speech was considered to be objectionable to be delivered before a student audience.

But the tempo that the national education movement and the students convention owed from the initiative of Mrs. Besant began to dwindle in proportion to her changing attitude to the Indian politics. With her pronouncement of support to the Montagu-Chelmsford Report of August 1917, Besant's role in Indian politics began to wane, as also her hold over the students.

Notes and References

1. See Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *History of the Indian National Congress*, Vol. I, p. 126.
2. *New India*, 4 April 1917.
3. K.P.S. Menon, *The Resurgence of India*, p. 7; also see *Many Worlds*, pp. 42-44.
4. *Fortnightly Report*, 17 November 1916.
5. *Ibid* 16 September 1916.
6. *Ibid* Pol. (D), September 1919, No. 50, NAI.

7. See MNNR, *Wednesday Review*, 9 August 1916; *Western Star*, 12 August 1916; *Andhrapatrika*, 24 August 1916.
8. *New India*, 5 July 1916.
9. *Home*, Pol. (A), August 1917, Procs. Nos. 86-106, p. 31, NAI.
10. MNNR, *Lokopakari*, 31 July 1916.
11. *Fortnightly Report*, 29 September 1916.
12. *Ibid.*, *West Coast Spectator*, 16 September 1916.
13. *Fortnightly Report*, 17 November 1916.
14. *Ibid.*, 18 December 1916.
15. *Ibid.*
16. G.O. No. 989, Public, (Confidential), 31 July 1917, p. 3, TNA.
17. *Ibid.* For an account of Home rule movement in South India, see D.A. Washbrook, *The Emergence of Provincial Politics*, pp. 288-329; Eugene F. Irschick, *Politics and Social Conflict in South India.*
18. *New India*, 2 March 1917.
19. Annie Besant, Presidential address delivered at the Behar Students' Conference, *New India*, 24 May 1917.
20. *Ibid.*, 29 August 1916.
21. *Ibid.*, 2 March 1917.
22. Editorial, *Ibid.*, 30 August 1915.
23. *Home*, Pol., Confidential, March 1918, Procs., No. 247, k.w., NAI.
24. See Annie Besant, *Order of the Star in the East.*
25. *Home*, Pol., Confidential, March 1918, Procs., No. 247, k.w., NAI.
26. For a brief history of Indian Scouting, see A. Appadorai (Ed.), *India: Studies in Social and Political Development 1947-67*, pp. 35-73. F.R. Pearce, *How Our Elders can help the Indian Boy Scouts.*
27. C.P. Ramaswami Aiyer, *Annie Besant*, p. 102.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
29. *The Hindu*, 4 April 1917; *Swadesmitram*, 4 April 1917; *New India*, 22, 24 November 1916.
30. For Basant's pronouncements on national education, see Lajpat Rai, *The Problem of National Education in India*, pp. 6-7; also see H.V. Dugvekar (Ed.), *National Education.*
31. *Home*, Pol., October 1910, No. 14, NAI.
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Home*, Pol. (Confidential), March 1912, Procs. No. 247, k.w., NAI.
34. This was founded by Colonel Olcott.
35. West Geofry, *The Life of Annie Besant*, p. 212.
36. For a brief account of the national education movement in Andhra started in the wake of Swadeshi movement, see Haridas Mukherjee and Uma Mukherjee, *The Origins of National Education Movement* (1905-1910), pp. 132-134.
37. *New India*, 16 January 1918.
38. *The Hindu*, 15 September 1916.
39. Weekly Chat, G.S. Arundale, *New India*, 5 February 1917.
40. *New India*, 1 December 1919.
41. *Ibid.*
42. The Bihar Students Conference since it was founded in 1906, held its annual sessions regularly until the beginning of the non-co-operation movement "when its activities slackened because all its front rank workers joined the

bigger agitation." See Rajendra Prasad, *Autobiography*, pp. 49-50.

43. *New India*, 23 September 1915.
44. *Ibid*.
45. For the proceedings of the first convention of the Bombay Presidency Students' Federation, see Arya Bhavan, *Report of the First Convention of the Bombay Presidency Students' Federation.*
46. *New India*, 1 December 1919.
47. A.S. Rajam, *Report of the First Madras Students' Convention held at Madras.*
48. *New India*, 27 December 1916.
49. For the full text of the presidential addresses of S. Subramonia Aiyer, G.S. Arundale, Prof. Agashe, see respectively, S.R. Murthy, *Speeches and Writings of Dr. (Sir) S. Subramonia Iyer,* pp. 340-361; G.S. Arundale, *The Path of Leadership; Fourth Madras Students' Convention, Madura, 26 December 1919, Presidential Address of G.S. Agashe.*
50. Started as the organ of the Madras Students Convention in January 1919, this journal had a circulation of about 250 copies.
    A Jeffery, Professor of History, Madras Christian College was the Managing Editor of the journal. K. Swaminatha Ayyar, a law student, was the working editor. Most of contributors were said to be law students who used a *nom de plume.*
51. MNNR, *Kerala Patrika*, 21 April 1917; *Manorama*, 17 April 1917.
52. MNNR, *West Coast Spectator*, 12 January 1918.

Chapter 4

Towards an Educational Penal Code

EVER since the advent of western education in India there was much discussion on the role of students in politics. Politicians, academicians and administrators gave varying interpretations at different times. The mind of Young India was at stake while answering this question. The British Government warned them from time to time against mixing up with the political problems of the country. The Indian politicians sought to interpret the presence and role of students in politics from time to time. Their interpretations was inconsistent, like the inconsistent nature of the whole course of the Indian national movement. But their protective posture with regard to students' rights helped them to tap young, the growing spirit of nationalism.

The Indian students were already nursed and nurtured in politics and political philosophy through the pages of European history. They were familiar with the revolutionary movements in America, France, Germany, Italy, Ireland, Egypt and China. This made it impossible to wean the student away from the political activities of his own country.[1]

Gopala Krishna Gokhale said that to the Indian student, an interest in politics was akin to the interest in his own country. All that was chivalrous, self-respecting and patriotic in his nature continually impelled him towards that interest. India had imbibed the ideas of patriotism, freedom and self-government largely from England herself. "Our politics today is, for the most part, a spread of these ideas among the people, and an attempt to apply them to our present conditions."[2] The most impressionable Indian minds were mostly affected by these ideals.

Without political education, political work cannot be carried out. This was why political education was imparted in schools, colleges and universities in countries like U.S.A. and France. From these educational institutions there came out many brilliant statesmen. Again, the debating societies and college unions in English colleges were "nurseries in which the English student is nurtured, preparatory to their entering the arena of their country's politics."[3] There, students held discussions on current political topics in the presence of their profes-

sors. Many statesmen holding positions in the government delivered lectures in these clubs and students carried on discussions before them.

Whereas political education was prevalent in free nations,[4] the policy of Government of India was to deny it to the Indians. Those Anglo-Indians who formed the bureaucracy on their coming to India brushed aside the highest and noblest traditions of the Anglo-Saxon race, and formed themselves into what Lord T.B. Macaulay had observed, "an official Brahmana caste."[5] When on the one hand, the government fixed fitness as a prerequisite to obtain Home rule, on the other, the government seemed to make Indians fit without imparting education, adequate to make them fit for political work.

By the systematic prohibition of students from taking part in politics, the government deprived them of a right, which their counterparts enjoyed all over the world, thus seriously infringing their liberty.[6]

On matters of religion, controversial theories of all sorts were being taught to students. The missionaries were unhampered in converting students from one religion to another.[7] Little anxiety was shown about the moral degradation of the students nor any attempt made to check the sale of tobacco and intoxicants among them. It came to this, that the government objected to patriotism and remained unconcerned to what else happened to them.[8] In the campuses no conscious attempt was made to enable the college student to acquire a political training. On the other hand, the policy-makers considered politics so dangerous a thing that the students were advised, nay, ordered, to eschew it.

In his Rectoral address delivered at the University of St. Andrews, Sir Stafford Northcote, Secretary of State for India, strongly urged the students to take an active and intelligent part in the politics of their country. He commended a genuine interest in political affairs among the educated youth of a nation as essential to preserve a true spirit of the democratic institutions.

Similarly, the Governor of Bombay while speaking at the Deccan College in the second week of October 1917, stressed the need on the part of students to encourage the habit of independent thinking and acting according to their conscience.[9]

But, in the metropolis of Madras, the infringement of these noble ideas was enacted, where a promising young man was subjected to the soul-crushing despotism of a foreign teacher. Mark Hunter, Professor of English, Presidency College, Madras, simply asked the students of

the B.A. honours class to write an essay on the responsibility of the European race towards the dark races. One of the students, Krishna Rao, the son of Amrita Rao, an assistant professor in the college, expressed certain sentiments in the composition paper in a manner which was not flattering to the European races as regards their alleged responsibilities towards the so-called "backward races" and as to how the European races were fulfilling their 'trust' or 'mission of civilization' in regard to them.[10] The independent view was unpalatable to the professor and he called upon the assistant professor to account for the conduct of his son. At first a simple apology was tendered which was turned down as not meeting the needs of the situation. In the elaborate apology submitted subsequently, the student expressed contrition for his offence and stated that *New India* daily and *India, a Nation* authored by Mrs. Besant and some of the works of R.C. Dutt were the authority for his view. In this instance, the student apologised out of fear that he might lose a source of his sustenance and be made to suffer unjustly for his self-respect and patriotism.

Mrs. Besant believed that the student should study the principles of politics and economics in relation to the history and the existing condition of his motherland but eschew them in political action, while he is in *statu pupillari*.[11] This view she consistently held throughout her political life in India. On the day of the partition of Bengal, the students of the Central Hindu College marked their protest by attending the college bare-footed. Mrs. Besant had come to know about this beforehand. "She came to the college on that day, stood at the gate herself,and sent back every student who arrived bare-foot."[12] At the anniversary of the Central Hindu College, this was repeated. She said, "Politics were for the old and not for the young, and boys as high as this—and she bent low showing the height to be only about 3 feet—cannot be expected to know the merits nd demerits of the partition of Bengal." "It is for the elders," she said, "to practice politics, the younger must only study them."[13]

Mrs. Besant became very unpopular for her stand that students should not meddle with politics. For this Dr. Nanjunda Rao of Mylapore, an extremist and political suspect, quarrelled with Mrs. Besant, and the quarrel was encouraged by "the most uncompromising enemy of the British Raj in southern India, Mr. Kasturiranga Iyengar, editor of *Hindu*."[14] Both of them believed that "any influence for good, politically speaking, which Mrs. Besant previously exercised over the

student population of Madras and Benares has been irreparably lost."[15]

Controversy on this topic gained momentum since the government issued orders and circulars prohibiting students from taking part in political matters. However, Mrs. Besant maintained that at a time when the world was under the threat of a holocaust the maintenance of the rule became more difficult, and some amount of excitement was inevitable.[16] True, the rule became inoperative for a section of the elder student population who were called upon by the government to recruit themselves in the Indian Defence Force under 'strict military discipline', so as to prepare to undertake garrison duty if called for. In all national calamities like this, "only the love of liberty and the hope of winning it, and of becoming citizens of an empire of free nations will inspire the students to empty the universities."[17]

The students, who found little guidance at home and still less or the reverse in the educational institutions, were left in jeopardy as to "where to turn for the sympathy in expression of that love of country, which finds a home in the heart of every young Indian throughout the land."[18] The students talked freely among themselves but on seeing teachers they hushed their voices. For an expression of sentiments similar to their own they looked everywhere but could not utter, with the result that "they grow up with the bitter side of their natures stifled and therefore bitter." The *New India*, identified this as the phenomenon of unrest among the student community of this country and took the challenge. True to its motto "For God, Crown and Country", *New India* took it as its immediate task "to combine passionate devotion to the motherland with larger service to the King Emperor and his vast Empire."

New India claimed that a number of youngsters turned to them "for that sympathy and understanding they ought to find in people rather than in newspapers, but which they find in newspapers rather than in people. Its editor had received hundreds of letters from youngmen, all over the country, rejoicing that *New India* shows them how to reconcile their patriotic devotion with that larger patriotism which is the vitality of the empire as a whole."[19] So, when the security attached to *New India* was forfeited that was considered to be an unhappy action.

It was impossible for the government to argue that the students were harmed by the study of politics and discussion of political problems. In deciding the question of how far students in India might legitimately take part in the political movements of the day, the administrators and

academicians completely ignored the voice of the parents. They neither regarded that the boys were the sons of Indians nor gave any importance to the opinions and wishes of their parents. The boys belonging to an inferior race according to them were to be moulded into docility by superior alien hands. It would be useless for elders, whether Indian or foreign, to try to crush a spirit that was found universal in the whole of India, from far north to far south. It was difficult to coerce such a spirit which may be guided into safe and useful channels.[20] Violence in Bengal began with the "Heads and Professors" by their flogging the young there. Those Professors and Heads who were incapable of winning over the hearts of the students by influence were in need of the rod of repression. "It is his alien religion or want of any religion that deprives the Professor of his legitimate influence over the students. Where birth and religion are foreign there is a gulf between the teacher and the taught."[21]

The question that Mrs. Besant posed to the authorities was why youngmen should not read politics, and why discussion of political problems should be bad.[22] She severely warned that their adventurous spirit and injured feelings and curbed freedom would lead them to do in secret what they were disallowed to do openly. Depriving them of their rights to study and discuss constitutional politics was tantamount to driving them into dangerous channels of anarchical crimes. This was what happened in Bengal, the Punjab and Uttar Pradesh. Mrs. Besant said that the Madras presidency too was on the verge of such a danger. To this she replied, "if Home rule propaganda does the harm of making our youngmen more patriotic, more courageous, more frank and less docile, less timid and less emasculated, then all Indians will agree that the more such 'harm' come to the young the better."[23]

The Lahore Government depicted the tendency of the students to participate in political meetings as an evil from which the young required protection. Politicians called them patriots, defenders of religion and saviours of their country, and, in response to this eulogy the students resorted to indiscipline and anarchy. The example of scores of school boys and students who succumbed to the "deceptive and perverted appeals" of the politicians, only to be drawn into the vortex of sedition and rebellion was cited.[24] Some of the victims were convicted, some went in self-assumed exile and some rectified their mistakes under home influences. Government thought it indispensable to prevent the recurrence of such tragedies in the interest of the

community as a whole, and especially of the rising generation.[25]

The government expected to keep the politicians tongue-tied and the press bridled, both refraining from making any statements unsettling the immature minds of schoolboys and thus exciting them to political action. In the face of such false expectations, the government, as the saviour of the empire, considered the neglect of action on its part to be criminal. With the march of time, restrictions grew in number and intensity, imprisoning the students in their educational institutions. But this measure, in effect, encouraged them to come out of the fortification by whatever means they could adopt. Both the Imperial and provincial governments were determined to eradicate the academic unrest with a crop of circulars issued at intervals. This brought about a situation where the remedy suggested worsened the disease instead of curing it.

It was believed that the Government of India Order of 1907 represented the minimum of control and the local governments were at liberty to make rules further to prohibit students in political movements as they desired. With the advent of the Home rule movement, orders absolutely prohibiting students from attending Home rule meetings were issued by provincial governments without reference to the orders already in force, thus flinging a challenge to the Home rule movement. But when all the forces of that movement were set against the Government Order, the whole question of prohibiting students from attending political meetings kindled a fresh excitement in the government circle.

In the wake of the Home rule movement, which involved the students in political agitation, the Home Department issued a circular on 20 March 1917, prohibiting their attendance at political meetings and held that the powers available under the Defence of India Act should be used to control persons who tried to influence the young. Following this circular, the local governments issued new orders stiffening the orders of 1907, bringing in a special reference to the Home rule agitation. Madras was the first, followed by Bengal on 16 May, Bombay on 7 June, Bihar and Orissa on 27 July, and Punjab on 30 July. However, the orders varied in the various provinces. Besides, the steps suggested were either inadequate or unworkable.

As the question of indiscipline affected the entire field of education, the Government of India Order of 1907, considering the difference between the "principle to be applied and the procedure to be adopted", dealt with four classes of persons, viz., (1) Schoolboys (2)

College students (3) School masters and (4) College professors.

As regards schoolboys, the Government of India Order of 1907 wished that in the interest of the boys themselves they should not be distracted from their work by attending political meetings or engaging in any form of political agitation.[26] Action could be taken, after due warning, against the boys or against the school itself, if attendance of boys at political meetings or their participation in political agitation was continued, encouraged or permitted by the masters or managers.

But the position of the college students was somewhat complex. The orders of 1907 did not prohibit them from participating in political meetings but prescribed action against them if they, even after due warning, conducted themselves at political meetings in such a way as to bring notoriety upon their college or engage in political agitation in such a way as to interfere with the corporate life and educational work of the place. But the orders of 1917, absolutely prohibited students from attending Home rule meetings.

A noticeable feature of the orders of the provincial governments was their amusing variety. Whereas the Madras Government prohibited only undergraduate college students and schoolboys from attending political meetings, the Bombay Government's order extended to all students, including graduates. The policy of the Government of Punjab was tantamount to converting teachers and professors into CID officers.

The Madras Educational Rules, which dealt with colleges under public managements and with both graduates and undergraduates, prohibited students from taking an active part in political agitation directed against the authority of government and engaging prominently in any public movement with which it seemed undesirable, in the opinion of the Principal, that persons in *statu pupillari* should be associated. Government Order dated 1 May 1917 required that no undergraduate student "shall be permitted to take part in public political discussions, to attend political meetings, to join any political association or to take part in any movement with which it is in the opinion of educational authorities, undesirable that persons in *statu pupillari* shall be associated."[27] In regard to the question of schoolboys, opinion was almost unanimous as to the inadvisability of their attending political meetings. *New India* wrote, "we have never advocated attendance of school boys at public meetings".[28] But it objected to the orders prohibiting them from taking part in arrangements connected with

political meetings.

There were no two opinions as to the question of bringing college students into active politics. Students were not given membership either in the Congress or in the Home Rule League. But the opponents of the restrictions urged the total removal of orders restricting students from attending public meetings and giving assistance as volunteers in the arrangements connected with the meeting. They urged that the students should not be deprived of the means to instruct themselves in political affairs. Newspapers were easily accessible to them. The students will take restrictions as an indirect incentive to attend more meetings and such measures gave the students the impression that government has a weak case.

Feeling of discontent, anger and unrest among students began to grow ever since the publication of G.O. No. 559, which prohibited them from attending all public meetings. The *New India* considered the G.O. as a nail in the coffin of the existing education.[29]

Although dated 1 May 1917, the G.O. was kept unpublished in order to shatter the arrangements already made for the most celebrated event of the year in Madras, the Provincial Conference at Cuddalore."[30] The G.O. served as a 'veritable bomb' against the arrangements, when on the eve of the first meeting suddenly a Superintendent of Police interfered and spread "consternation among the volunteers and those responsible for the comfort of hundreds."[31] The student community was already rendering yeoman service to the Congress and this had been noted seriously by the government. These volunteers who came within the purview of the order were hastily replaced by vakil gumastas.[32] The order, for the student community, was a bolt from the blue.

The G.O. made a tremendous impact on the public of the Madras presidency. They became unprecedentedly conscious of the necessity of evolving a national system of education which alone could serve the need of the time. The *New India* described the plight of the students who passed out of the university and emphasised the need for a national system of education in its place. "The youngmen are passing out of the University every year and they will pass out without the training in political matters and the duties of citizenship which alone might have saved them from the inclination towards revolutionary methods so natural to youth."[33] According to Annie Besant, the G.O. could throw into a state of angry rebellion all who were eager to hear a great Indian on a visit to his town. She went on further: "They will be at the bars of

their prison houses, where their teachers have become their gaolers, and their love of country, gagged and shackled, will turn into angry bitterness."[34] As the speeches of the great men of their country were tabooed to them, Annie Besant considered that, no public political teachings would be able to reach them. Thanks to the situation, the mind of the student community would be poisoned by secret conspirators and anarchists, repeating Bengal in Madras.[35]

In the Ganjam District Conference held on 17 May 1917, the G.O. was severely condemned by a resolution. By seconding the resolution, V.V. Giri, a young barrister of Law at that time and later the President of the Indian Republic, characterised the order as highly tyrannical. He considered that youngmen would be coming out of the university with much resentment and feeling of panic for fettering their liberties in every way during their academic life. Then he referred to the Indian students in England where they were at liberty to discuss questions of political importance affecting the welfare of this country or England. He wished that the order might be reconsidered and withdrawn at the earliest.

In July, the Governor of Madras and the DPI met the Principals of Colleges of the Madras presidency. Thirty-five Principals were present and various matters came up for discussion. "But, G.O. 559 was the *piece de resistance* of the meal set before the Principals, and His Excellency must have been non-plussed at their refusal to swallow it."[36] The fact that various Anglo-Indian Principals were in the forefront to object to the order, was noteworthy. The impossibility of carrying out the order was clearly brought out. The Principals were certain that it would bring about misunderstanding between them and the students, resulting in great deterioration in the standard of discipline among the college students.[37]

As an alternative to the system of spying by teachers over their students, it was suggested to employ the police. But His Excellency replied that the "G.O. was 'educational' and could not be managed by police."[37] About the outcome of the conference, *New India* in its leaderette said: "The lack of appreciation of the G.O. by those who were expected to be enthusiastic in carrying it out, must have been most painful to His Excellency and the further disinclination on their part to suggest modifications, and their eager desire to bury it, show clearly that at this, the funeral of poor G.O. 559, there were no mourners except its parents. Metaphorically speaking, wringing his hands, His

Excellency left the corpse to the discretion of the Principals who, we have no doubt, being men more in touch with public opinion, will know how to dispose of it swiftly."[39] No wonder, the Principals paid no heed to the said orders. They began to honour the orders more in the breach than in the observance.

A meeting of college and High school students was held at Guntur, when a resolution rejecting the G.O. was submitted to the DPI, duly appended by signatures of about 350 students.[40] Similarly, in Masulipatam, students publicly attended several meetings, defying the G.O. On 9 September, they held a huge public meeting in the town hall to protest against it. A resolution[41] was carried amidst great enthusiasm without any dissenting voice. It was also resolved to submit a memorial to government requesting them to rescind the G.O. In Trichinopoly about 200 students decided to disobey the order.[42] Every student, questioned on the point, expressed similar attitude of defiance.[43] The student heroine of Bombay, N. Sivakami Ammal, was conspicuous by her presence in all these places. A brilliant medical student at Bombay, she plunged into active work in the Home rule movement when she heard about severe government action against the Home rulers.[44] The heads of educational institutions were not unaware of the student protests. The G.O. had conferred arbitrary powers on the heads of the institutions, which were sometimes over-exercised. In Guntur, about 256 college and 150 high school students were turned away from protesting against the G.O.[45] The Principal of the Hindu College demanded an unconditional apology from the students, who gathered on 8 September 1917 at the residence of C.V. Venkataramana Ayyangar, to pray for the repeal of the G.O.[46] Principal Statham of the Kumbhakonam College set up a good precedent, who, knowing that his students had followed a procession, admonished them not to do so and refrained from punishing them for the first mistake.[47]

Some Principals, smelling danger, connived at the student protests, and others, not realising how and when to exercise the powers entrusted to them treated the students worse than slaves. Principal Sankunni of the Palghat Victoria College belonged to the latter category. Lack of patience on his part rendered the college atmosphere turbulent. The trouble started when he dismissed three Intermediate students on 18 September and fined three others for having accompanied a procession held in connection with the internment day.[48] Of the three senior Intermediate students verbally expelled, one was asked

to be shoved out for the fault of having asked for a written order of expulsion.[49] Another one was handed to police custody on a charge of house trespass.[50] As a protest against the police rule, over a hundred students of the college stopped going to the college. A public meeting to discuss the problems involved was adjourned on the offer of the sub-collector to intervene and set matters right. The Principal was obstinate and demanded a fine of Rupees ten and an unconditional apology within a prescribed time. The students protested and went on strike. At this point, he became helpless. All kinds of people including the collector and the DPI were summoned to his aid.

The Madras University Syndicate passed orders on the fate of the three expelled students of the college for "gross insubordination", by permanently debarring them from appearing for any examination of the University.[51] The three victims of this sentence were D. Parameswaran, N. Ramaswamy and K.S. Ramaseshan.

The Registrar of the Madras University sent another circular to the Principals of all affiliated colleges expressing the views of the Syndicate regarding the conduct of students taking part in strikes, and drawing the attention of the students to the penalties to which they exposed themselves. The circular treated a student strike not merely as an act of defiance, but also as a rupture of all relations between the strikers and the university. The circular also laid down severe punishments to strikers, amounting to their deprivation of privileges like admission, scholarships and so on.[52] The college authorities were assured of support in their endeavours to check insubordination and maintain sound discipline.[53]

A reversal, complete or partial, of the government policy in relation to G.O. No. 559 was expected when the Madras Legislative Council was given an assurance that the topic was receiving the attention of the authorities. But the outcome was another G.O. empowering heads of colleges to enforce at their discretion the orders in G.O. No. 559, thus making the students now responsible both to the government and to the Principals of the colleges.

Though the new G.O. was issued in supersession of the previous order purportedly to remedy some of the resultant evils of the latter, the general principle underlying the former was not in the least changed. The modification was made in response, the G.O. claimed, to the representations made by various college authorities that, while they were in complete agreement with G.O. No. 559, the terms were

unduly rigid and deprived Principals of the discretion which rightly belonged to heads of colleges.[54]

In reply to a question in the Imperial Legislative Council in September 1917 as to whether it was a fact that the majority of those who were consulted had expressed their inability to give effect to G.O. No. 559, it was stated on behalf of the Government of India that they did not think it necessary to issue fresh instructions overriding the Risely Circular issued on 4 May 1907.[55] The govern- ment's decision to modify the G.O. after the above statement might have been influenced by "the fact that they had exercised their power more severely than the other Governments." Or it might have been due to their having been reminded by the Government of India of having exceeded their powers, without the latter's approval, or to their having been moved by the representation of the students and the public."[56]

The revised G.O. recognised the force of this criticism and entrusted its enforcement to heads of colleges. It was assumed that "in doing so they would receive the support of parents and guardians of students."[57] It granted the discretion to heads of colleges regarding actions to be taken against the attendance of students in public meetings. Their discretion was to be exercised "in the circumstances of their respective institutions", a mysterious phrase, hard to understand.

Even the modified G.O. was capable of producing mischievous results. The Government Order expected "in full measure" the support of parents and guardians of students for the carrying out of the wishes of the government by the heads of colleges. Instead of realising their folly of prohibiting students from coming into contact with the foremost public figures and also their failure to recognise the shortcomings at the time of the execution of the order, such as evasion and the encouragement of deceitfulness, and the marring of the amity of feeling between the teachers and the taught, the government began to take a firm step on a lost cause.

Till 1917, Madras Educational Rules had permitted undergraduates to attend political meetings. Graduates and undergraduates on the rolls of colleges, under public management were forbidden by the Madras Educational Rules to take active part in agitation against the authority of the government.[58] The rules originally required abstention from taking part in seditious activities. It would suffice if the Principals or wardens of institutions were empowered to frame either temporary or permanent rules and see that the students did not engage in unde-

sirable activities. But the G.O. was a definite departure from this. It was ominously captioned "students taking part in political meetings." The phrase that "attempts were being made to bring students under the influence of political propaganda" was too vague. Mention was not made as to where the previous rules were found insufficient and as to the basic principles underlying the G.O. whereas the previous rules applied only to the Government Colleges, the modified G.O. included the private colleges also.

But, when this G.O. and its counterparts in other provinces branded politics as a 'forbidden fruit', the authorities falsely expected that the atmosphere of pure study would return. As a result of the operation of the G.O., politics invited considerable attention of the students. In Trichinopoly, the Home Rule League associates numbering about 300 were disbanded. The notice calling upon the students to vacate the venue of Home Rule League meetings was disobeyed. College students numbering about 2,000 in Trichinopoly town evinced much opposition to the G.O. This was more or less in tune with the reactions in other districts. The G.O. No. 1531 sounded the difficulties incumbent on the heads of various colleges on the matter of giving effect to its immediate predecessor. Parents disapproved the order. To compel obedience from an uncompromising young intellectual was certain to make the measure unpopular.

The mode of petty tyranny that was employed in carrying out the G.O., too, created much chaos and excitement.[59] It is apt to recall the remark of Sir Bepin Bose who was not an extremist at that time: "Absolute prohibition will only aggravate his natural craving and will give him a grievance just or unjust, but nonetheless, a grievance. The 'Old Adam' survives in boys all the world over. They crave for the forbidden fruit, because it is forbidden here as elsewhere. The result is that an unhealthy spirit is evolved and is spread from boy to boy.[60]

Notes and References

1. *New India*, 28 July 1917.
2. D. G.Karve & D.V. Ambekar, *op. cit.*, p. 192.
3. *New India*, 28 July 1917.
4. "The Madras Government and the Students". *Kesari*, reproduced in *New India*, 1 June 1917.
5. MNNR, *The Andhra Patrika*, 1 August 1917.
6. See Annie Besant, *The Future of Indian Politics*, pp. 330- 331.

7. MNNR, *Andhra Patrika*, 20 December 1917.
8. *New India*. 31 May 1917.
9. *New India*, 18 October 1917.
10. *The Hindu*, 17 October 1917.
11. *New India*, 2 March 1917.
12. Sri Prakasa, *Annie Besant, As Woman and as Leader*, p. 135; also see MNNR, *Justice*, 22 May 1917.
13. *Ibid.*, p.135.
14. Supplementary Note on the Theosphical Movement, Home, Pol. (D), 9 June 1913, NAI.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *New India*, 2 March 1917.
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*, 29 August 1916.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*, 2 March 1917.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Also see Ganesh & Co. (Pub.), *Mohomed Ali Jinnah: An Ambassador of Unity*, pp. 136-137.
23. *New India*, 9 May 1917.
24. Education, Pt. (A), Confidential, March 1918, No. 39, NAI.
25. *Ibid.*
26. G.O. No. 799, Education, 2 December 1907, TNA.
27. G.O. No. 559, Home, Education, 1 May 1917, TNA; *The Hindu*, 7 May 1917.
28. *New India*, 18 May 1917; MNNR, *Dasamata*, 9 May 1917.
29. *Ibid.*, 17 May 1917; commenting on the G.O. No. 559, the *Justice* of 10 May 1917 observed: "The Government order is like shutting the stable door after the horse has been stolen. His Excellency the Governor-in-Council has come rather late to this conclusion. But the parents and guardians of most of the youngmen concerned have been of the self-same opinion all along, and students in schools and colleges in Madras have unfortunately been under the influence of the new political propaganda. Why were the Madras Government inactive so long—why were they rather indifferent spectators of what was going on—we could not ourselves understand unless, indeed they took Mrs. Soul force, as she describes herself". Pro-British papers like *Non-Brahman* and *Kerala Patrika* maintained the same tone.
30. MNNR. *Indian Patriot*, 12 May 1917; *Swadesamitram*, 12, 15 May 1917.
31. *New India*, 10 May 1917.
32. *Fortnightly Report*, 17 May 1917.
33. *New India*, 11 May 1917.
34. *Ibid.*
35. *Ibid.*
36. Editorial, *New India*, 25 July 1917.

37. MNNR, *Swadesamitram*, 7 December 1917.
38. *New India*, 25 July 1917.
39. *Ibid.*
40. MMNR, *Krishnapatrika*, 8 September 1917.
41. The resolution read: "As G.O. 559 is calculated to curtail long-enjoyed opportunities of students for their many-sided development and disturb the amenities between the teachers and the taught, this meeting of the students of Masulipatam respectfully prays for its early cancellation especially in view of the general opinion expressed at the Conference of Principals convened by H.E. Lord Pentland that the G.O. was undesirable".
42. MMNR, *Manorama,* 14 September 1917.
43. MMNR, *Swadesamitram*, 1 September 1917.
44. *New India*, 9 August 1917.
45. MNNR, *Vaisyamitran*, 24 September 1917.
46. MNNR. *Hindu Nesan*, 10 October 1917.
47. MNNR, *Swadesamitram*, 28 September 1917; *Dravidan*, 12 September 1917.
48. *New India*, 18 September 1917.
49. *Ibid.*, 22 September 1917; MNNR, *Hindu Nesan*, 26 September 1917 .
50. *Ibid.*
51. University Registrar's letter, *New India*, 17 November 1917; also see MNNR, *Swadesamitram*, 17 November 1917; *Hindu Nesan*, 19 November 1917.
52. *Ibid.* The Circular said: "A strike is not merely an open defiance of authority, but practically amounts to a rupture of all existing relations between the strikers and the College and University, in consequence of which a student foregoes his rights and privileges as a college student in a University and forfeits all claims to redress or even consideration by his college authorities or the university, of any grievances, real or otherwise, which may have promoted his action. The Syndicate feels that in the true interests of education it is its duty to exercise the powers vested in it by Regulation 96 (v) in dealing with such serious misconduct as a strike. The penalties provided by the Regulation are exclusion from any University examination either permanently or for specified period or deprivation of any University scholarship or endowment held by the delinquent or both.. Also see *The Hindu*, 17 November 1917.
53. *Ibid.*
54. G.O. No. 1531, Home, Education, 3 December 1917.
55. MNNR, *Swadesamitram*, 7 December 1917.
56. *Ibid.*
57. G.O. No. 1531, Home, Education, 3 December 1971, TNA.
58. G.O. No. 1031, Home, Education (Misc.), Series, 10 August 1917, TNA.
59. Referring to the G.O. No. 559, *Krishanapatrika*, 12 May 1917 observed that the restriction on students would bring "Student life as near as possible to the life of plants in flower pots, yielding implicit obedience to the Government".
60. *New India*, 9 August 1918.

Chapter 5

Non-cooperation and Education

ON the eve of the outbreak of the First World War the Indian national movement was weakened by disagreements over ends and means and by governmental repression.[1] But the war saw the emergence of new political factors. It witnessed the rise and growth of Mrs Besant as the pacesetter of the Indian national movement. She called upon her followers to strike the iron when it was hot and demanded Home Rule as the price for help towards the war. The internment of Mrs Besant brought her popularity, and this led her to the presidential *gaddi* of the Indian National Congress in 1917. But her jail life brought change in her political strategy and she was found pleading in the AICC meetings held in March 1918 for unconditional support for the war. This altered position marked the beginning of the decline of her influence. The ultimate aim of the moderates was to bring changes in Indian society with British help and by the gradual introduction of Home Rule in India. They held the British rule in high esteem for they counted the introduction of English education, constitutionalism and the legal system, as the legacy of the British Raj. Annie Besant's work in India was to help the evolution of an Indo-British Commonwealth leading to a world commonwealth. The nation was at her feet, when she was interned. At Gandhiji's suggestion, it was proposed to launch an All-India Satyagraha campaign in order to get her released. But a collision was averted when the government released her, followed by the announcement of the Montagu-Chelmsford reform proposals. The young Congressmen were frustrated when Besant welcomed the proposals and desired to effect the reforms. Coupled with this, the death of Bal Gangadhar Tilak created a vacuum in Indian politics. It was at this moment that Gandhiji took up the stewardship of the Indian struggle by leading the Rowlatt Satyagraha. By this time, he could attract the attention of the nation towards him through his success in the triple satyagraha in 1917-1918 at Champaran, Kaira and Ahmedabad. He had already a splendid record of political experience in South Africa. Though he was not altogether a stranger in India, his advent in Indian politics was slow at the

beginning. He remained an uncommitting student of Indian politics in the first year. He knew that most of the Indians held that the British rule was unreliable and inconsistent, and that the solemn promises, proclamations and treaties of the British were but scraps of paper, and, therefore, efforts should be made to make it impossible for them to go back on their promises. He identified India's aspiration to be the attainment of Swaraj, and believed that non-cooperation with the British Government was the only method to obtain it.

As the first step, he wanted to protest against the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs by a non-violent method. Later, he wanted to bring about the complete paralysis of the British hegemony. With this object in view he wanted to change the working pattern of the National Congress. He wanted the Congress to raise a national fund and establish national schools, colleges and universities and to hold conferences at village, taluk, district and provincial levels to broadcast the gospel of 'Swaraj.'

Gandhiji's idea of non-cooperation could get only a mixed reception in the Madras Presidency.[2] The first expression of this attitude became obvious when the non-cooperation resolution was put to the vote in the Madras Provincial Conference held at Thinnevelly in June 1920.[3] Rajagopalachari, who was emerging as the Gandhi's man in the south, managed to carry the non-cooperation much against the objection of the nationalists. The support to Gandhiji's programme came mainly from the League of Youth and the Khilafat Muslims. During his tour in Tamilnadu, in this period, though Gandhiji explained his programme to his critics, the Madras PCC at its meeting on 24 August accepted the non-cooperation proposal, without the council boycott measure.[4] But, the special Congress Session held at Calcutta adopted Gandhiji's non-cooperation programme at an all India level much against the opposition of Bepin Chandra Pal, C.R. Das, Kasturiranga Iyengar, Satyamurthy, V.O. Chidambaram Pillai and others.

It was in the light of these developments that the Nagpur Congress of December 1920 declared the object of the Congress to be the attainment of Swaraj by the people of India by all legitimate and peaceful means. This was a definite departure from the earlier creed of the Congress. Henceforth, the Congress was determined to work for the attainment of self-government outside the British Empire. In pursuance of its programme, the Nagpur Congress resolved to take effective steps to:

1. "call upon the parents and guardians of school children under the

age of 16 years to make greater efforts to withdraw them from schools, owned, aided or controlled by the Government, and concurrently to provide for their training in National Schools or by other means;

2. call upon students aged 16 and above to withdraw without delay, irrespective of consequences, from the institutions mentioned above, if they felt it against their conscience to continue in institutions dominated by a system of Government which the nation had solemnly resolved to end. Such students were advised either to devote themselves to some special service or to continue their education in national institutions;

3. call upon trustees, managers and teachers of Government-affiliated or aided schools, and municipalities and local boards to help to nationalise them."[5] The other courses included legal, and commercial boycotts, popular appeal, organizational and financial matters. The deciding factor in carrying out Gandhiji's dream, "Swaraj in one year", was men and money. Towards this Gandhiji and his lieutenants did propaganda work during the intervening period between the close of the Nagpur Congress and the Bezwada session of the AICC. In Bengal the movement was spearheaded by C.R. Das and B.C. Pal, and in the Punjab, by Lajpat Rai. These leaders and other provincial Congress leaders explained the Nagpur resolution to the people.

The response of the student population to the appeal was immediate in Bengal and the Punjab, where they took the message of the Congress to the villages, raised men and money, taught the illiterate and tried to remove untouchability, encouraged the revival of home industries by spreading the use of spinning and weaving, held arbitration courts and preached temperance.[6] This was the splendid work done by the student workers in pursuance of the Congress resolutions.

In a strongly-worded letter addressing the parents and boys of Aligarh, Gandhiji called the system of the British government Satanic, as was the system under Ravana's regime, according to the Hindu scriptures.[7] He considered the ending of this rule as the supreme necessity and this transformed him completely. Hence he advised the youth of the country to leave their schools and colleges in spite of the objections of their parents. According to Gandhiji, "the time has come for every young man in this country to make his choice between duty to God and duty to others."[8] He valued duty to God above all. In fact, he claimed that thousands of parents that he met supported the resolutions on non-cooperation with wonderful unanimity, and there was hardly any who objected to the proposal to boycott schools. Gandhiji

C. O. L. ASHOKNAGAR
HYDERABAD.

323.2095482
S52R.

said that the destiny of the nation "lies not in us, the parents, but in our children."[9] He added, "Shall we not free them from the curse of slavery which has made us crawl on our bellies? Being weak we may not have the strength or the will even to throw off the yoke. But shall we not have the wisdom not to leave the cursed inheritance to our children?"[10]

Gandhiji, in another brief letter, asked the students of Wilson College, Bombay, to "be of some help in enabling them to solve the question" of the boycott. Gandhiji referred to the various sins of the government, and stated that he had no hesitation in saying that "it is sinful for us to receive education in schools and colleges conducted by it or through it." He held that it would be "better to be without such education or even to suspend it till we have received redress."[11]

145

Gandhiji's was an open invitation to the student community to participate wholesale in the fight for freedom. This was also an open challenge to the government which, from time to time, enacted circulars prohibiting students from taking an active part in politics. It was believed that the closure of schools would serve to paralyse the government. Gandhiji's programme was equally criticised as not conducive to the welfare and prosperity of India. It was also suggested that the local Congress Committee should advise students not to leave schools and colleges until better facilities for education were provided for them.[12]

When Bengal and other provinces broadened the base of the political movement by enlisting the students who were withdrawn from the educational institutions, the response to this part of the non-cooperation programme in the Madras presidency was rather slow. The position was regretted and the students were persuaded by the Urdu newspaper, the *Quami Report*, on the following lines. "At present Islam needs true Musalmans who may stand firm for God, and explain to their Government that the independence of the Khilafat and holy places is the one aim of our existence in this world and in the next. It is our primary duty to resign ourselves to the will of God and his prophet, utterly regardless of gain or loss."[13] Again, the same paper reminded that the duty of the children for the sake of Islam was considered to be the sacrifice of their education. At a time when Islam was in danger at the hands of world powers, it was unseemly for the children of Islam to be "desirous of taking B.A. or M.A. Degrees to become Vakils or barristers." It continued that "the children should judge for themselves whether the degrees make them devoted or disloyal to Islam. The Prophet Abraham's son was willing to be sacrificed in obedience to his father whereas the son of the Prophet

159490
53577

Noah disobeyed his father and went over to the mischief makers."[14] It exhorted the students to throw their lot with the nationalists in order to live honourably. It also condemned the rival endeavours to persuade children by telling that Gandhiji was ruining the education.

In pursuance of the non-cooperation movement, the people of Madras, like those of other provinces, passed resolutions, verbal and oral, that even the governmental educational institutions should renounce government grants and sever connexion with the Madras University.

Annie Besant, who fought unflinchingly against non-cooperation, condemned Gandhiji's programme as a futile attempt which had no relation with 'Swaraj'. Gandhiji's attempts to bring students into political involvements was also strongly criticized by Annie Besant. She called the attempts of Gandhiji and the Ali brothers, the "invasion of the Destroyers," and lamented that "the generation that would have been leading Bengal in the van of the propaganda for freedom is broken and dispirited, and there is a gap between the older politicians and the coming politicians."[15]She questioned the rights of the students who were still in pupilage to take hasty political action at the risk of their future life.[16] She accused Gandhiji of attempting, after having failed among the mature intelligentsia, to stir up the young intellects by preaching to their parents and teachers to disobey, and of seducing them "from the great institutions built up by the patriotic Indians by long years of sacrifice."[17]

The student-folk were a bit reluctant to swallow the non-cooperation programme as such. But with the visit of Gandhi to Madras in August 1920, a large number of students were converted to his creed. K.P.S. Menon has recalled one of Gandhiji's meetings, the one held in the open courtyard of the Madras Christian College, where he was a student in 1920. "The quadrangle was one sea of faces; every doorway, every window, in the sorrounding buildings was occupied. Students hung even on the branches of the trees, for Gandhiji's reputation had preceded him to India as the man who had pitched his body and soul against the wicked Government of South Africa."[18] But the public meetings gathered by Mrs Besant ended in a pandemonium, where the students indulged in stamping, yelling, and blowing whistles and horns, and roared with shouts of 'Mahatma Gandhi Ki Jai'.[19] Mrs Besant attributed the demoralization of the students to the breaking of their discipline. Though there was an exodus in response to the boycott call, they later returned to their institutions. Mrs Besant called these the

farce of the non-cooperators. But she failed to realise that, with the advent of Gandhiji, a new political force had appeared in the Indian horizon. This trend has been beautifully pictured by K.P.S. Menon who wrote that during the ascendancy of Gandhiji as "an adventurous navigator who would take India beyond the gulf of Home Rule and the straits of Dominion status into the swelling sea of independence. . . ., Mrs Besant became a waning star, vying in vain with the rising sun."[20]

Gandhiji was comparatively a new force in Madras politics. He had no following there, except for a minority of Gujarati merchants, settled in business in Madras. Like his triple satyagrahas in the north he had hardly any chance to make any impact of his presence felt in Madras except during his visits in 1896, 1915 and 1919.[21] So it was very difficult for him to find a following in Madras as against the fortification of Besant and the nationalists. But the conversion of the League of Youth, an association of a small group of the moffusil law students, added support to the Gandhian cause.

The League which was formed by the turn of the year 1919, aimed at changing the youth of the country, which was mostly passive, subordinate to other's will and leadership, into a confident, self-directed and self-respecting community aware of their responsibility towards their motherland. The Leaguers wanted the young men to be in uniform activity in politics, 'politics' not in its restricted sense.[22] This was a definite metamorphosis in the attitude of students towards politics. Facilities through lectures, pamphlets, meetings, courses of study and annual conferences, were made to provide the young with opportunities for political study. The political ideal of the League was defined to be "the realisation of self-Government for India within the British Empire."[23] The League, a movement of forward-looking young men and women, came into being as a fulfilment of their desire for some medium through which they could unite with others of the like mind, face without bias the complex problems which confronted their generation, acquire a broad background of knowledge on those problems, and, thus equipped, take definite action towards solutions that would be constructive. The rules of the League defined the object of the League to be "to organize the youth of the country so as to enable them to find full and effective self expression in all spheres of public life and generally to promote their interest."[24] It was the feeling of the League of Youth that Indian politics had till then run in narrow and rigid channels owing partly to the external cause of having to fight against odds in the face of a powerful bureaucracy, and mainly to the fact that

the eager ethusiasm of the south had been carefully and vigorously kept out of the pale of public life. The League was formed in order to enable the young to take their rightful place in politics. Some of the outstanding features of a programme which the League had wished to realise were absolute equality of the sexes, universal compulsory education, a more equitable adjustment of the relations between capital and labour, and radical social reform. The political ideal of the League was defined to be "the realisation of self-government of India within the British Empirs."[25]

The League as a political group firmly stood for the abolition of caste and other distinctions based on one's birth. Another novel feature of the League was that it was intended to work for the franchise of women including their right to enter the professions and the service of the state, and also for the abolition of the legal disabilities of women in matters of ownership of property, inheritance, etc.[26] Again, the League recognised the supreme importance of the problems of the poor in India and advocated "the ensuring of decent conditions of living for the poor by the intervention of the state or otherwise."[27] The desire of the League to work for the abolition of the principle of seniority that obtains in professions, and its insistence upon merit irrespective of age, shows its firm determination to stand against gerontocracy. The League was expected to work as an All-India organization with its headquarters in Madras. Any person between the ages of 18 and 35, who subscribed in writing to the objects of the League, was entitled to its membership. The League started the publication of a weekly organ entitled "Youth".

Like many students of that period, the members of the League of Youth too were not convinced of Gandhiji's programme in the beginning. Rather, they were excited to learn about the non-cooperation programme and were very sceptical about its outcome. If the boycott programmes culminated in the overthrow of the British, they thought that the result would be chaos and anarchy. But Gandhiji's visit to Madras in August 1920, and his great speech on the Madras beach, ended this way of thinking and convinced many among this group of the efficacy of his programme. An opportunity came to some members of the League of Youth to clarify their doubts when they met Gandhiji face to face at a meeting held at the Khilafat office at Madras, the next day. In this meeting, at which many top leaders like, V.S. Srinivasa Sastri, G.A. Natesan, Yakub Hasan and Rajaji were present, Gandhiji explained his programme very cogently. At the close of his talk, K. Santhanam, a law graduate and a member of the Youth League, asked

Gandhiji "whether, he actually expected large numbers of students, lawyers and government servants to boycott schools, courts and offices."[28] Gandhiji replied to the following effect: "I do not know. It would be as God wills, but I am sure of two things. If there is sufficient response, the British will come down and we shall succeed in achieving our ends. In any case, there is nothing impracticable for any individual person to accept the programme. For instance, barring your own disinclinations, what is the difficulty for you who have not yet even started practice of law to give up the idea and join the movement ?"[29] Gandhiji's answer dispelled the doubts of many. But Gandhiji did not bring the new converts to his fold all at once. When they expressed the desire to join the movement, Gandhiji said that if, after seven days they were of the same opinion, he would happily take them.[30]

Rajaji offered them an opportunity to accompany Gandhiji who was on a tour to Malabar. During this trip these young men were further attracted by the saintly qualities of Gandhiji, from his words and movements and the popularity he gained as evidenced from the gatherings that greeted him at every railway station. This gave him a halo, unlike that of other contemporary leaders. By the time they returned to Madras, the Youth Leaguers were completely converted to the Gandhian programme. Gandhiji, who was convinced on the firmness of their decision welcomed them to his fold and exhorted them particularly to take to Khadi work.[31]

During the early part of the academic year 1920-21, a certain amount of unrest among students was found when they began to attend political meetings without any hindrance and enrol themselves as volunteers. Though these manifestations had no direct effect on the educational institutions the students were in close touch with the political developments. The concurrent meetings of both the Indian National Congress in December 1920, and the All India College Students' Conference, had an immediate effect upon the student population. In both these bodies resolutions were adopted to boycott all government and government-recognised educational institutions. The Conference of students finally resulted in a resolution approving of non-cooperation in an "unconditional, wholesale and immediate form."[32]

On 24 November 1920, a meeting of the students of Madras was held at the Soundarya Mahal, under the Chairmanship of C. Rajagopalachari, in order to consider the question of the boycott of government and aided schools and colleges. Students of the Pachaiyappa's College and the Madras Christian College presented themselves in large num-

bers at the meeting. At the outset, when C. Rajagopalachari was asked about the steps that his sons took as regards the question of boycott, he replied that both his sons agreed with his suggestions to withdraw from the colleges. Then arguments in favour and against the boycott questions were made, in which one student mentioned that if paralysation of the government were the object of the non-cooperation movement, non-payment of taxes ought to be started first. Later, when a resolution approving the principle of boycott was put to the vote, it was found that in an audience of nearly 400 students, 10 were against it and two were neutral.[33] In a meeting of the students, held at Triplicane beach in the middle of December 1920, R. Chinnaswamy, one of the speakers observed that the call for Indian freedom had come to the students and urged them to pledge themselves to work for it until the dawn of freedom.[34] Appu Nair, another speaker held that the students of India could win Swaraj singlehanded. Hameed Khan, the chairman, in his concluding remarks, appealed to the parents not to prevent their boys from their sacred duty of boycotting schools and colleges.[35] Great headway was made since then, and in successive waves the movement spread to other places, maintaining its maximum force in any province for not more than a few months. Agitation was also noticeable among the students in the colleges at Vizianagar, Cocanada, Rajahmundry, Masulipatam, Guntur, Nellore, etc.

The Director of Public Instruction during his visit to the schools of Bezwada, found that all the boys had kept away from the schools.[36] At Vaniyambadi, in North Arcot district, a terrific battle was waged for the control of the Islamiah College and the Muhammadan Girls' School, between the trustees and Yakub Hasan.[37] The local Muhammadans threatened to withdraw their subscription to the school to force them to forsake the government aid. The parents and the boys indulged in programmes of social and religious boycott. This resulted in the reduction of attendance of students in the colleges by 75 per cent. A new lease of life to the boycott situation was given when threats of violence and social ostracism were resorted to, in an attempt to enforce surrender of titles and educational grants from the governments.

One unique feature was that, in this case, the pupils were not persuaded to disobey their parents and guardians but the parents were responsible for the trouble.[38] Besides, the dispute was linked with the non-cooperation movement, but the authorities contended that the trouble was connected with the general factional politics of the place.[39]

Subsidence of the election tension gave time for the non-

cooperators to pay attention to the boycott of educational institutions. They made many inflammatory speeches in several meetings of students in Madras.[40] The tendency among the students was to attend political meetings in large numbers and howl down speakers whom they disapproved.[41] At one of these meetings, a declaration of war against the government was made by Yakub Hasan who said that "agitation had now got to continue till 'Swaraj' was obtained, whatever happened with regard to the Punjab disturbances and the Khilafat question."[42]

When the failure of boycott of legislatures administered in "the first and crucial setback for non-cooperation in Tamilnad,"[43] declaration of the election results, coupled with the departure of some eminent non-cooperators to attend the Nagpur session of the National Congress, created a lull in the political agitation. Attempts were continued in Madras to boycott colleges but with insignificant returns. However, a demonstration of students, 1,500 strong, held in Madras, stood as an exception to this. Led by Muslim volunteers, the demonstrators carried banners bearing such mottos as "Be poor, but free," "Boycott Connaught,"[44] etc.

The visit of the Duke of Connaught created much unrest among the students of Calcutta. An attempt made, however, among the students, to follow the Calcutta lead and abandon their schools and colleges, proved infructuous.[45] The government towed a very careful line on this.

The schoolboys aided by their masters, were frequently used in India as an instrument of boycott for the furtherance of political aims. This agency was called "volunteers". The special Congress at Calcutta, held in early September recommended the creation of a Volunteer Corps for the maintenance of discipline and order.[46] The non-cooperation agitation included boycott of foreign goods and liquor. It was through the agency of volunteers that all the items of the boycott programme were carried out. The Nagpur Congress of December 1920, had called for the creation of a National Service Corps for spreading propaganda in the provinces.[47] However, the nationalists did not interfere with this aspect of the non-cooperation movement. Whereas in the other provinces enlistment under the new scheme was rapid, the Madras Presidency lagged much behind. Before the non-cooperators organized the National Volunteer Corps, separate 'national' or Khilafat corps were organized by Hindus and Muslims respectively. *Rama Dandu* (Rama's Army), raised by Duggirala Gopalakrishnayya of Guntur, was one among them. This found prominence in many places in the Northern

Circars. The Corps combined in itself Hindu fanaticism with military discipline.[48] Gopalakrishnayya, the leader, represented himself as Hanuman leading the army of Rama (Gandhiji) against Ravana (the government), and this concept was reflected in the practice of volunteers taking "vows in temples and attending the temple as a writ on set days."[49] Though young men had been urged to volunteer themselves, no attempts were made to use them in organized bodies either in the Congress propaganda or in agitational work. Besides, no evidence of drilling of these volunteers was there.

The corps of Mohammadan volunteers, organized by Khilafat leaders, was a very important aspect of the Khilafat movement. When the annual conference of the Majlis-ul-Ulema was held at Tanjore, a volunteer group called 'The Servants of Islam' was formed to keep order at the conference. Its strength was between 300 and 500. Though it was drilled and showed some military discipline, no attempt was made to make it a permanent organization.[50] A new volunteer corps was formed in Madras city for observing hartal on 19 March 1920. The main object of the corps, which was composed mainly of young men, students and others, was "to restrain people from committing violence."[51] Though its activities were similar to those of the national volunteers, its quasi-military form and their display in Khaki uniforms and processions marked the difference with the latter.[52] The students of the Islamia College at Vaniyambadi constituted another division of the Khilafat corps.

A Mohammadan volunteer corps was raised by enrolling about 200 men for the purpose of propaganda among the lower classes. Shaukat Ali was accorded a warm reception at the station by this volunteer corps, on his arrival at the station. These young men wore Khaki uniform with crescent badges.[53] A part of this corps was disbanded. It was decided to retain permanently the remainder for social service and propaganda, or, as Shaukat Ali said, "to keep the torch of British injustice burning."[54] Though a certain number of Muslims joined the national volunteer corps organized by the non-cooperators by the end of 1921, the Khilafat volunteers remained a separate entity. But with the wane of Khilafat agitation its volunteer movement too began to wither.

The first fortnight of Feburary 1921, witnessed redoubled efforts on the part of the leaders of non-cooperation to win recruits to their cause. In addition to carrying out various boycott programmes, which also included carrying of flags in processions, serving as peons and guards

at houses where meetings were held, and keeping order at meetings, the vounteers were employed in raising funds for the Congress. The service of Singaravelu Chetti, a prominent Youth Leaguer, for the Congress party, was greatly appreciated.[55] Some of the corps were given semi-military training, and it was reported that Andhra Pradesh was more noted for such corps than Tamilnad. The schoolboys in Guntur district were asked to work in the villages during the vacation and preach non-cooperation.[56] For this they were offered Rs 30 per month. They were given training in public speaking, and the national schools were used for this purpose.

Individuals who called themselves volunteers got into trouble for picketing and making violent speeches, but they were dealt by the authorities as individuals.[57] A good deal of volunteer activity was reported from several quarters. This included the Godavari district, the Muhammadan centre of Vaniyambadi in the North Arcot district, and the Ganjam district. In the city of Madras, it was decided to reorganize the movement and to start a school and a daily paper for volunteers who were to be recruited only from the educated classes. "The Young Citizens Union" was started in Madras with the object of training young and energetic workers to canvass in municipal elections.[58] During the anti-liquor agitation in late 1921, volunteer organizations such as the *Telugu Santi Sena* (Peace Army) and the *Tamil Tondar Padai* (Army of Devotees) were formed to serve both the regions as a non-violent strike force of the civil disobedience movement. It was felt that, in the chief town of every district, volunteer organizations should be constituted and trained for a month. An army of 200 for each district, by the beginning of March, was thus trained, to further the cause of non-cooperation in the right way. Under the stewardship of the teachers the 'peace armies' were expected to subjugate the fortress of bureaucracy. The *Telugu Santi Sena* and the *Tamil Tondar Padai* were 3,360 and 1,899 strong respectively, in February 1922.[59] The TNCC claimed that the volunteers numbered a thousand in January 1922.[60]

The resolution on the boycott of educational institutions run by government, passed at the Nagpur Congress, marked a major departure from the concept of national education that had existed during the Home Rule days and before. The Nagpur resolution advised the "gradual withdrawal of children from schools and colleges owned, aided or controlled by government, and, in places of such schools and colleges, the establishment of national schools and colleges in the

various provinces.[61] Against strong disapprobation from elder statesmen like Madan Mohan Malaviya, Gandhiji forced the Congress to adopt this resolution at the national level. The main plank on which he advocated the triple boycott was that 'Swaraj could be obtained within one year'. Further, he argued that it was inappropriate for the students to continue their studies in institutions run by a satanic government which was guilty of the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs. Again, he firmly believed that it was within the reach of the public to replace the official institutions with a set of parallel national institutions.

Pattabhi Sitaramayya has noted that a large number of national institutions came into existence as a result of the great impulse created by the plea for national education. Of the triple boycott, the turn out of the educational boycott was the most effective. It was reported that the number of students in colleges was reduced from 52,482 in 1919–20 to 45,933 in 1921–22, and, in secondary schools, from 12,81,810 in 1919–20 to 12,39,524 in 1921–22.[62] This unprecedented exodus of student non-cooperators was much against the ability of the sponsors of the movement to provide alternative educational institutions. Still, in the tempo of the movement, many national institutions were founded. Prominent among them were the National colleges at Calcutta and Patna, Bihar Vidyapith, National Muslim University of Aligarh, Gujarat Vidyapith, Kashi Vidyapith, Bengal National University, Tilak-Maharashtra Vidyapith and a large number of National schools of all grades spread out in all parts of the country.[63] Out of 1,227 national institutions established all over India during 1921-22, with a total enrolment of 78,571, the share of Madras was 92 with an enrolment of 5,072.[64] But these national institutions met with the same fate of numerous institutions which were started in the wake of the anti-partition agitation. In Andhra, the sole survivor was the Andhra Jateeya Kalasala.[65] At Udipi, in South Kanara, national schools were started each with an attendance of 150 boys. In Vizagapatam two schools were started, of which one survived only for a day. Attempts were made by the trustees or local bodies having lenience towards non-cooperation, to convert their institutions into national schools. The instance of the Islamiah school at Vaniyambadi, around which a terrific tussle for control was held, goes to prove it. In Kallidaikurichi, in the Tinnevelly district, a national school was started in the premises previously occupied by a secondary school.[66] The Congress Working Committee allotted special loans to Tamilnad for Khadi and national education. Rajagopalachari was the man entrusted with the task of

disbursing the amount, as he thought appropriate.[67] With this fund he met the salaries of the national school teachers and lawyers who had renounced their positions, in favour of the non-cooperation movement, and the expenditure incurred for propaganda work against the legislature.[68] Till August 1921, allotment of funds made by the TNCC was for the purpose of starting seven national schools.

Attempts were made to spread the manufacture and use of Khaddar. The movement adopted Charkha as its symbol. The wearing of Khaddar assumed the form of defiance of government, and the spinning wheel (charkha) was considered to be a means to inculcate patriotic views in the minds of the students of schools and colleges, with emphasis on the revival of industries. But, it was later criticized vehemently as 'premium on political insanity'.[69] Though its economic value was great, its educational value was found negligible with "supreme dullness of this particular form of manual exercise." The temperament of the child was also against the dull job. And no wonder, the charkha receded from the curriculum as soon as it was introduced. The Director of Public Instruction, Madras, had issued circulars to the District Boards and Municipalities and to the headmasters of schools, directing them not to permit the introduction of spinning wheels in their schools.[70] Supporters of the introduction of charkha into the educational institutions criticised that such a step was not unusual on the part of "a Government which smells foul odour even in the antidrink campaign."[71] But the criticism against its introduction was more vehement. The educational authorities considered that the charkha, 'the wheel of the political fortune' was introduced under the pretext of vocational instruction. It was considered that "the charkha as a plant in cottage life may not be an obnoxious thing but as an instrument of political salvation, it has a deleterious effect on juvenile training. It would be most stupendous folly to instil into young minds an economic theory, pregnant with serious danger to the well-being of society constructed after the modern model."[72] V.O. Chidambaram Pillai, who disagreed with the non-cooperation movement, said that the hands of youth were to carry swords and not to rotate charkhas.[73] "There are another 37,409 private institutions with 6,36,329 pupils giving a very poor kind of education but those can hardly be reckoned. As to cost, in 1917-18, the expenditure from public funds amounted to Rs 6,48,01,695. In the following year it rose to Rs 7,17,26,292."[74] In the light of the failure of the Herculean task of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya to raise funds for the Hindu University, which reached not

even one crore, the *Gujerati* prophesied this part of the Gandhian programme to be an impossibility and characterised it as a "downright absurdity".

M.R. Jayakar, a follower of Gandhiji and President of the Thana Conference, called the educational boycott and "experiment in youthful sacrifice."[75] According to him Gandhiji's education campaign failed to achieve the expected results. He viewed that the Congress workers "concentrated too much on the disruption of existing institutions and less on the creation and maintenance of new ones on national lines."[76] The youth who responded to the call of the Congressmen were neglected and left idle in the streets. The failure to provide them with any substitute led them to catastrophe.

Sir Asutosh Mukerji, the Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University, said in 1921, that the non-cooperation movement damaged the career of the students as well as the machinery of education. He pointed out that in boycotting schools, the education of 40,000 or 50,000 young boys below college age was interrupted.[77] He considered this irrecoverable wastage of time to be a national calamity. This also prematurely ended the educational career of three or four thousand college students. On the side of damage done to the machinery of education, the loss suffered by the Calcutta University, under the head of examination fees, as a result of non-cooperation, was calculated to be Rs 2,63,000.[78] The loss of fee suffered by the educational institutions, which entirely depended for their subsistence on the fees, he remarked, would reduce the efficiency of these educational institutions, affecting the mental training of the youngsters.

Sir C. Sankaran Nair, to whom Gandhiji's non-cooperation campaign appeared to be an "egregious blunder", condemned his philosophy of education as well as his call to boycott the educational institutions. The system of education which Gandhiji advocated had already been introduced in some parts of India. The teaching confined to eastern classics and vernaculars had resulted in producing a mentality which separated Hindus from non-Hindus, Brahmins from non-Brahmins, the caste Hindus from non-caste Hindus.[79] Again, he said that the recipients of this education longed for speculative theories and showed distaste in scientific truth, a legacy left by the British.[80] Gandhiji neither cared to ponder over these questions nor wanted to spread western education among the masses.[81] Sir C. Sankaran Nair summed up the failure of the campaign of Gandhiji in the following words: "By far the majority of the aided institutions in Bengal have been recog-

nised by the educational authorities to be very inefficient and they disaffiliate them or reduce their numbers to give more efficient instruction to those who remain, as a good number of them were institutions started for commercial purpose. It is remarkable that the great majority of the students, who obeyed the Congress cause, belonged to these aided institutions. Those who left the Government schools and colleges with better discipline and more efficient teaching were few, if any."[82]

The boycott of educational institutions has to be regarded in two aspects, viz., political and educational. Though the movement was at bottom political, the Government of India believed that the expression of revolt against an imperfect educational system was projected to "serve as a cloak to the more sinister designs of agitators."[83] It was explained that the people had the education that they had asked for, and that the attempts made by the education department for the preceding thirty years had been thwarted by the people themselves. The education imparted in most of the national schools was found inferior to that of the recognised schools. But the government viewed that any attempt to kill the national schools would only help to stabilise their position.[84]

At the same time the government did not pretend to entertain any doubt about the genuineness of the outcry against the teaching of language or literature in the country inspired mainly by economic conditions. Why were the followers of Gandhiji against the education imparted in English schools? Whereas education should make the youth manly and useful in future life, the English education was defective in both these respects. "The lowest grade of it benefits them only for service as postman, daffadar or constables. One who stops with the IV or V form can at best hope to be a petty clerk or to make a living by writing petitions or being witnesses in registration offices. And, again, the fact that no technical instruction is given in present day schools makes young men coming out of them detest all avocations which will benefit the country and improve its resources. They prefer service on a low salary and prey upon people."[85] The proverbial rigidity of the examination system and the undue severity of the Madras University also went to strengthen the argument.

The national school movement subsided with the suspension of the non-cooperation movement in 1922 after the outbreak of violence and the imprisonment of Gandhiji. But the scathing criticism of the politicians against the English system of education opened the eyes of the students that they were burdened with an education "ill suited to

their practical needs."[86] The study of the annals of the Holy Roman Empire turned their minds to the great liberalism and nationalism of the nineteenth century, whereas the study of economics made them desirous of applying the general principles to the problems of the distant lands. "Students, both at school and at college, began to wonder whether they were trained for life and for service or for mere success in the examinations, for it was the ideals of service that were uppermost in their minds."[87]

Though the non-cooperation movement owed its strength to the expression of revolt against the inherent evils of the educational system, the system survived the ordeal. But it drove deep into the minds of the authorities the urgent need for reorganising the educational system, thus putting the educational reform on a par with the economic and political changes of the country. They realised that "if the function of education is the adaptation of the future citizen to his environment, then the content of education must change in harmony with changes in that environment."[88] With this, education became a provincial transferred subject in 1921. Education came under the charge of the Minister responsible to the provincial legislature, and the Indian people obtained a free hand in shaping the educational policy as to the needs of the country.[89] The British Government claimed that after 1915 education in India received a fillip "so much so that in Madras alone, up till 1929, the number of educational institutions had risen to 58,000, the number of students to 2,80,000 and the annual expenditure to 545.75 lakhs of rupees, whereas in 1915 it was about half this sum."[90]

The non-cooperation movement brought into effect the second upheaval of the scheme of national education.[91] In its wake there were set up a chain of national educational institutions and a large number of students got involved in the politics of the nation. But with the ebb of the tide of the movement, many national educational institutions became defunct and the students returned to their former institutions.[92] This situation brought discredit to Gandhiji, who for some time suffered eclipse, giving the chance to the constitutionalists to go with their experiments with the council-entry programme. However, Subhas Chandra Bose defended Gandhiji's policy of withdrawing students from educational institutions. He said "nevertheless, if one dispassionately sees the situation in the country in 1920-21, the conclusion will be irresistible, that the Congress had no option in the matter, if it desired its resolution to be translated into action."[93] Netaji's words were in appreciation of the students' role in politics

which thenceforth became a unique phenomenon in all political movements in India. Besides, his words supported these national leaders who thought it compelling to make use of the student power to realise a common aspiration like the achievement of 'Swaraj'. More than anything else, it justified the increased participation of students in executing decisions of national importance.

Notes and References

1. D.A. Low (Ed.), *Soundings in Modern South Asian History*, p. 158.
2. David Arnold, *The Congress in Tamilnadu*, pp. 44-45.
3. P. Kodanda Rao, *The Right Honourable V.S. Srinivasa Sastri: A Political Biography*, p. 86.
4. *The Hindu*, 25 August 1920; Judith M. Brown, *Gandhi's Rise to Power*, p. 258.
5. P.C. Bamford, *Histories of the Non-co-operation and Khilafat Movements*, p. 22; K. Iswara Datta, *Congress Cyclopaedia*, p. 378.
6. For an account of the role of students of Bengal and the Punjab in the boycott movement, see R.C. Majumdar, *Struggle For Freedom*, pp. 339-342; B.M. Taunk, *Non-Cooperation Movement in Indian Politics*, 1919-1924, pp. 52-54; Also see Shan Muhammad, *Freedom Movement in India – The Role of Ali Brothers.*
7. Home, Pol.(A), December 1920, 210-216 & k.w., NAI; *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Vol. xviii, pp. 421-422.
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Ibid.*
11. *New India*, 4 November 1920.
12. MNNR, *Kerala Patrika*, 29 January 1921.
13. *Quami Report*, 26 January 1921.
14. *Ibid.*, 1 November 1921.
15. *The Theosophist*, November 1920; *Annie Besant, Builder of New India*, Besant Spirit Series, p. 155.
16. *New India*, 30 January 1920.
17. *Adyar Bulletin*, November 1920.
18. K.P.S. Menon, *Reminiscences*, in Madras Christian College Magazine, March 1937, p. 129.
19. *The Theosophist*, March 1921; *Annie Besant, Builder of New India*, Besant Spirit Series, p. 122.
20. K.P.S. Menon, *loc. cit.*
21. David Arnold, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
22. *New India*, 22 December 1919.

23. *Ibid.*, 1 May 1920.

    The pioneers of this movement were S. Ramanathan, Rajagopalan, K. Santhanam, K.S. Venkataramani, N. Sundaram, N.S. Srinivasan, K.S. Subramoniam, P. Govinda Menon, V. Raghavachari and G.V. Krupanidhi.

24. *Ibid.*, 5 April 1920.
25. *Ibid.*, 1 May 1920.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*, 8 May 1920.
28. Publications Division (Ed.), *1921 Movement: Reminiscences*, p. 172; K. Santhanam, "*How I first met Mahatma Gandhi*", 'Bhavan's Journal', XV, 16 March 1969, pp. 33-35.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 173.
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*
32. Home, Fol., FN, 185 of 1928, p. 128; also see R.C. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, pp. 340-341.
33. *New India*, 25 November 1920.
34. *Ibid.*, 20 December 1920.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Fortnightly Reports*, 16 November 1920.
37. *Ibid.*, 3 December 1920.
38. *Ibid.*, 18 April 1921.
39. *Ibid.*
40. *Ibid.*, 17 December 1920.
41. *Ibid.*
42. *Ibid.*
43. David Arnold, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
44. *Fortnightly Reports*, 6 January 1921.
45. *Ibid.*, 2 February 1921.
46. *The Non-cooperation and Khilafat Movement in the Madras Presidency*, p. 5.
47. K. Iswara Dutt, *op. cit.*, p. 374; also see Judith M. Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 316-318.
48. *The Non-cooperation and Khilafat Movement in the Madras Presidency*, p. 28.
49. *Ibid.*
50. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
51. *Ibid.*
52. *Ibid.*
53. *Fortnightly Reports*, 4 May 1920.
54. *Ibid.*
55. K. Murugesan and C.S. *Subramanyam*, Singaravelu – *First Communist in South India*, pp. 9-19.

56. *Fornightly Reports*, 3 May 1921.
57. *Ibid.*, 19 December 1921.
58. *Ibid.*, 1 March 1922.
59. David Arnold, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
60. *Ibid.*, see Appendix II.
61. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit.*, p. 203.
62. P.C. Bamford, *op. cit.*, p. 103.
63. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op. cit.*, p. 211; see Appendix III.
64. S.N. Mukerji, *History of Education in India*, p. 209.
65. *Fornightly Reports*, 17 March 1921.
66. *Ibid.*, 19 July 1921; Eugene F. Irschick, *op. cit*, pp. 269-270.
67. David Arnold, *op. cit.*, p. 50.
68. *Ibid.*
69. *The West Coast Reformer*, quoted in G.O. No. 803, 7 October 1922, Annexure II, TNA.
70. See P.C. Bamford, *op. cit.*
71. *Kistna Patrika*, quoted in G.O. No. 803, 7 October 1922, Annexure IV, TNA.
72. G.O. No. 803, 7 October 1922, Annexure II, TNA.
73. K. Baladandayutham, *Jeeva Valkkai Varalaru*, (Tamil), p. 28.
74. Quoted in *New India*, 7 October 1920.
75. M.R. Jayakar, *Story of My Life*, p. 619; M.P. Sreekumaran Nair, *Values in Conflict*, p. 71.
76. Sir C. Sankaran Nair, *Gandhi and Anarchy*, p. 144.
77. USS File (Confidential), No: 699/30, p. 51, TNA.
78. *Ibid*; S.N. Mukerji, *op. cit.*, p. 210.
79. Sir C. Sankaran Nair, *op. cit.*, p. 67.
80. *Ibid.*
81. *Ibid.*, pp. 67-68.
82. *Ibid.*, pp. 70-71.
83. Letter (Confidential) from H.S. Sharp, Secretary to the Government of India to All Local Government and Administrations, 19 February 1921, Pol. (Pl, & B) February 1921, Procs., 259, NAI.
84. Letter (Confidential) from P. Lory (DPI) to G.G. Adam Esquire, ICS (PSG), 13 October 1922, Education, Pt. Deposit, December 1922, Procs., 8, NAI.
85. MNNR, *Desabhakthan*, 11 November 1920.
86. P.C. Bamford, *op. cit.*, p. 107.
87. *Ibid.*, p. 108.
88. *Ibid.*
89. *Home*, Pol., Confidential File No. 411/1930, p. 26, NAI.
90. Question to Congressites, Published by the Government of Madras, USS File, 699/30, Vol. II, p. 72, TNA; see Appendix IV.

91. J.P. Naik, Syed Nurullah, *A Students' History of Education in India*, 1800-1973, p. 304.
92. For statement showing the number on rolls and the average daily attendance in educational institutions on 31-3-1922, see Appendix V.
93. Subhas Chandra Bose, *The Indian Struggle*, p. 65.

Chapter 6

Civil Disobedience Movement

THE Government of India Act of 1919 had provided for the appointment of a Statutory Commission to review the working of the reforms of 1919 in India. According to the Act, the Commission was due in 1929, ten years after the introduction of the reforms. The party in power in Britain, the Conservative Party, was afraid of being ousted by the Labour Party in the elections of 1929. Unsympathetic towards the Indian aspiration for complete independence, the Conservative Party appointed the Commission two years earlier, viz., 1927, thus forestalling all possibilities of the Labour Party conceding complete independence to India.

The Royal Commission appointed was headed by Sir John Simon, a member of the British Labour Party. The Commission included only British elements and Indians were excluded from it. Thus, the timing as well as the composition of the Commission was to meet the British interests. The exclusion of Indians from the Commission caused much disappointment, and all leaders of public opinion in India, irrespective of their party affiliations, took the unanimous decision to boycott the Commission. The movement was spearheaded by the Congress. The appointment of the Simon Commission thus gave a fillip to the political movement in India[1], which had for some time eclipsed since the failure of the non-cooperation movement of 1920. At all places it visited, since its landing in Bombay on 7 February 1928, the Commission was greeted with black flags and demonstrations throughout their stay in India.

A new manifestation of the youth movement in Madras was the repercussion of the Simon boycott on the youth. Some of the Youth organisations in the city, hitherto concerned with social and educational activities, had begun to turn to politics. A split occurred in the Madras Youth Conference, at a meeting held on 20 January 1929 under the presidentship of Srinivasa Ayyangar. Whereas the official group decided to eschew politics, under the impact of the personal influence of Srinivasa Ayyangar, the rival group disagreed with them and formed a United Youth Conference with the boycott of the Simon Commission and other political matters among its objects.[2] The Madras Youth

Conference, which was anxious to hold the conference before the arrival of the Simon Commission in the Madras city, met with difficulties in finding a President. While Subhas Chandra Bose declined to preside over the conference unless it were held in March or April, K.F. Nariman, who had earlier accepted the invitation, had to withdraw as he was held up in Bombay by the riots.[3]

In Madras, a body named Simon Boycott Propaganda Committee was formed with S. Satyamurthi as its chairman. Its object was to carry on an intensive propaganda through the press and the platform, and also by posters and leaflets.[4] Students were exhorted to absent themselves from schools and colleges. The boycott committee issued a hand bill dated 22 January 1928, appealing to the students of Madras to observe a complete hartal on 3 February, the day of the landing of the Commission in Bombay. It also said: "It is the students of every country that have played a prominent part in organising and even leading the mass demonstrations to rouse the patriotism of the people for the vindication of the birthright of freedom. . . The students of Madras studying in both schools and colleges are expected to undertake this responsibility most cheerfully and abstain from attending their schools and colleges on the day of the national hartal and participate enthusiastically in the procession and other demonstrations to be organised on that day in our city."[5] On 3 February, a riotous mob attacked the restaurant of Messrs Harrison & Co. in Broadway. That was sternly suppressed by the police who arrested five persons. Later they demonstrated before the High Court for the release of the arrested men. In the skirmish that followed, the police fired, killing one person.[6] In connection with the disturbances, twenty-six persons were arrested that day[7], and military aid was invoked to restore peace and order.[8] In an appeal issued to the press, the Madras Congress Committee called on the youth to enist themselves as volunteers for the various boycott movements. It was decided that the street propaganda work would be carried out by the 'younger and less prominent adherents.' It was decided to conduct picketing and black flag demonstrations during the visit of the Commission to Madras. The members of the Simon Boycott Corps were clad in Khaddar uniform.[9]

The non-Brahmin students formed the '1929 Madras Youth Conference', to counter the Congress agitations by voluntarily doing propaganda work on behalf of the government. By holding meetings in Chingleput and North Arcot districts, they explained to the villagers the viewpoint of the government and exposed to them the follies and

fallacies of the Congress programme.[10] The League came to be recognised as a minor counter-revolutionary force after the meeting held in Madras on 14 February 1929, organised by V.T. Arasu. Resolutions welcoming the Simon Commission and advising the youth to eschew politics were passed.[11] Letters introducing V.T. Arasu and his associates were given to the District Magistrates of Andhra to provide them with facilities for their propaganda work. Later they were also given similar introductory letters to enable them to visit the Tamil districts. For their visit to the Kistna district, they billed the government but were only partially paid. Thereafter, the government was convinced of the uselessness of its service and toned down its assistance.

A marked development of the youth movement or of the volunteer organizations was noticed in Bengal as well as in Bombay.[12] Elsewhere, it seemed either less developed or insignificant. This was the beginning of a definite metamorphosis in the Indian youth movement. About this eventful period Subhas Chandra Bose remarked: "The years 1928-29 witnessed an unprecedented awakening among the youths. The halting attitude of the Congress at Calcutta and the stale tactics of the Swarjists in legislatures roused the youths to a sense of their duty. The success of the first session of the Youth Congress at Calcutta served as an inspiration and a further impetus came from Jatindra Nath Das through his martyrdom."[13]

The idea of independence was generally considered visionary when it emerged in the year 1928. This was because the nationalist leaders met with no specific success in the endeavour to enlist wide mass support for the nationalist cause. But soon a party of men, small in number but determined in spirit, emerged to "translate independence to a definite policy and to organise themselves with a view to creating such widespread unrest in the country that the government will be intimidated into making sweeping concessions."[14] To this end, they discussed and supported youth movements and volunteer organizations, and they were successful "to a considerable extent in some parts of India in maintaining a ferment among the student classes, who are the natural raw material of political agitation, and sections of educated middle classes, especially the literate unemployed."[15] However, by 1928, the youth of the country had begun to identify themselves with the struggle for freedom and began to enlist themselves as soldiers in the proposed battle of 1930. In the forefront of the movement were Nehru, Subhas Chandra Bose, Yousuf Meherally, K.F. Nariman and Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya.

Hitherto, the Congress volunteers, recruited at the time of each Congress session, ceased to function with the termination of the session. With the passage of time, particularly after the non-cooperation movement, the need for a disciplined and trained army of volunteers was much felt. This need came up for discussion,[16] when the All India Volunteer Conference met in December 1923, at Cocanada, concurrently with the Congress session. The outcome was the emergence of the Hindustani Seva Dal. The Dal was formed as an All-India Organization to raise an army of fully disciplined volunteers of freedom, to work at any time, for the national cause at a great moment of her destiny. The Congress, with a resolution at its Cocanada session, welcomed the proposal, thus:

"The Congress is of opinion that in order to train the people of India and make them effective instruments for carrying the lines laid down by the Congress, it is necessary to have a trained and disciplined body of workers. This Congress, therefore, welcomes the movement for the formation of an All-India Volunteer Organization and calls upon the working committee to take all necessary steps to form such a body of trained workers in cooperation with the organisers of the movement and to keep control and supervision over it, while giving it freedom of internal management and administration."[17]

From its very beginning, the Congress Working Committee took over the control and supervision of the Hindustani Seva Dal. At the same time, it was given the freedom of internal management and administration. The Conference annually elected an All-India Board which functioned as the Executive of the Dal. An Academy of Physical Culture was started at Bagalkot, in Karnataka, which was open to volunteers from all over India. Though Karnataka became the main centre of training of volunteers, many camps were held in different parts of the country. The demand for trainees outgrew the supply.[18] Orderly and efficient service rendered by the trained Dal volunteers, at the Belgaum Congress session in 1924, demonstrated that "the youth of India was alive and awake and, if properly trained and guided, was equal to any kind of national service."[19]

The Hindustani Seva Dal movement was fairly widespread in the Madras Presidency. Its branches were opened in Madras, Kumbakonam, Vellore, Gudiyattom, Guntur and Chittoor. The important leaders who stimulated active recruitment were N.S. Hardikar, the President of the Dal and B.S. Moonje. Under the auspices of the Madras branch of the Dal, foreign clothes were collected to be burnt

on Gandhi Jayanti Day. The decision to observe the National Flag Day all over the country, on the last Sunday of every month was taken at the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1928. The Dal volunteers had been celebrating the Flag Salutation Day since then.

The youth movement was intended to be an organization for the promotion of a revolutionary spirit among young men, whereas the formation and activities of the volunteer organizations which were devoted to physical culture, exhibition of feats of strength, lathi exercise, and so on, provided its weapon.[20]

In Bengal it was stated that "there were many signs of activity in the various youth movements, and that several meetings had been held in which the necessity for self-sacrifice was impressed upon students and the use of violence advocated, and it was explained that the movement was gaining strength and the tendency towards violent methods was increasing."[21] The young men were exhorted in the numerous meetings and conferences to serve their country by deeds and not by words.

It was proposed to start a new organization in Bezwada, to impart training to youths in physical culture and political oratory.[22] The organization was to be called "The Andhra Ratna Young Men's Association." Manoranjan Gupta of Bengal took an active part in this organization. A meeting organised by the League of Youth in the city in the month of September 1929, was addressed by several ladies who extolled village reconstruction and the use of Khaddar. The League of Youth, started by the theosophists in West Godavari, was reported to have distributed Khaddar. Youth League activities were fairly widespread in the districts. Nadar Youth League in Madura, Andhra Youth League in Kistna, Yadhavakula Youth League in Trichinopoly, Rayalseema Youth League of Service an organization embracing the ceded districts and Chittoor, Self-Respect League and the Non-Brahmin Youth League in Trichinopoly, and Youth Leagues in Vizagapatam, Virudhunagar, Ramnad and Cuddapah, were some of them. In the month of February 1930, two other Youth Leagues were formed in Malabar and Madura districts at Malappuram and Tirumangalam respectively. While promotion of the moral and physical well-being of youths was the object of the former, the latter decided to carry out programmes of the Congress whatever they might be.

In the month of November the Madras Youth League organized a procession to celebrate the Universal Temperance Week. The Hindustani Seva Dal and the Madras Labour Union assisted them in this.[23] Three members of the League visited Trichinopoly and made a futile

attempt to start a branch of the League there. For discussing amendments to its constitution and for drafting its annual report, the Madras League of Youth held busy meetings. In addressing one of its meetings Cuthbert Wigham of "The Society of Friends" advocated rural reconstruction work. P.C. Ray of Calcutta appealed to them, in another meeting, "for the cultivation of a national spirit and the eradication of untouchability and illiteracy."[24]

Concurrently with the Andhra Provincial Political Conference, a Youth Conference was also held at Bezwada in the month of November 1930. K.F. Nariman who presided over the Conference appealed to the young men to join the forthcoming political struggle in 1930.[25] The most important of the resolutions passed advocated independence.[26] Mrs Lakshmipathi, who was elected President of the Madras Youth League, exhorted the League "to be prepared to give effect to the policy of Civil Disobedience if decided upon"[27] at the Lahore session of the Congress. This was on the occasion of the annual celebration of the League on 15 December 1930. Her exhortations failed to get unanimous approval since some members doubted the propriety of the League in working for political aims. She had to wait until 20 January 1930 to get a few resolutions passed at a meeting of this group approving the declaration of complete independence and the boycott of the legislatures. Yet the Executive Committee of the League was unprepared to go to this extent.

The League of Youth suffered a temporary eclipse in the early months of 1930. The Concord Day celebration on 31 January was poorly attended. The moderate tone of the speeches delivered in the League meetings showed the lack of sympathy of the general public for extremism. An appeal for funds made at public meetings and through the press received a poor response and only a paltry amount could be collected. To add to the financial stringency of the League, there was the cut in its subvention by the Madras District Congress Committee. This situation became more clear from the reaction of H.D. Raja, member of the AICC, Secretary of the Bombay Youth League and Editor of the *Young Liberator*, who paid an extended visit to Madras during this period to enlist financial support for his paper. In the beginning he opined that organizing the masses under the intellectual leadership of the youth was essential for the achievement of independence.[28] But at the end of his visit, he lamented the lethargy and lack of bold leadership among the youth of this province.

The Madras Congress, held in 1927, passed unopposed, a resolution

proposed by Jawaharlal Nehru, for complete independence.[29] The (Motilal) Nehru Report, which was published in August 1928, was a retreat from this objective, as it favoured dominion status.[30] This was unacceptable to the young generation in the Congress led by Jawaharlal Nehru, Subhas Chandra Bose[31] and Srinivasa Iyengar. Led by Jawaharlal Nehru, the Independence for India League was formed to condemn the (Motilal) Nehru Report and restore the complete independence ideal for the Congress.[32] The controversy reflected the rift between two generations, represented by the two Nehrus, the father and the son.

The intervention of Gandhiji as the mediator in this controversy marks a turning point in national politics. Since the failure of the non-cooperation experiment Gandhiji had suffered a temporary eclipse in national politics so that the Swarajists could go ahead with their experiment in constitutional settlement. The failure of the constitutional experiment, timed with this debacle on the question of Congress objective, marked the return of civil disobedience and its author Gandhiji, to the Congress politics. Gandhiji suggested that if India had not been accorded dominion status within a year, the Civil Disobedience Movement would be launched in order to win complete independence for India.[33]

A state of fluidity was discernible in Indian politics. Lord Irwin, the Viceroy, remained adamant for ten months since the Calcutta ultimatum of the Congress. He was not in favour of the liberals and moderates joining the ranks of the confrontationists against the Raj. When the count down had begun, Congressmen were much occupied with the launching of the civil disobedience programme. It was at this late hour that Lord Irwin announced the convening of a Round Table Conference at London, to discuss the next stage of the constitutional settlement. Gandhiji could not stop the momentum gathered by the civil disobedience ideal except by alienating Jawaharlal and thus bringing about a split in the party. Gandhiji was unprepared for such an eventuality. So the Congress, in December 1929, resolved to go ahead with the disobedience campaign for complete independence instead of finding salvation in the dominion status likely to be granted at the Round Table Conference.

The Congress Working Committee which met on 2 January 1930, took steps to implement the Congress resolution on the boycott of the Legislative Council. It was also decided to observe 'Purna Swarajya Day' on 26 January 1930, all over India. The leadership of the civil

disobedience campaign naturally went to Gandhiji, who offered an eleven-point proposal to Lord Irwin. It included total prohibition and abolition of salt taxes. In a letter sent to Lord Irwin on 2 March 1930,[34] Gandhiji explained his decision to embark on civil disobedience if the government failed to accept the eleven demands. The march to Dandi became inevitable when the Viceroy rejected the ultimatum. The historic march to Dandi began on 12 March 1930 when Gandhiji left his Ashram at Ahmedabad, accompanied by 79 "Padacharees." On 5 May he was arrested. Gandhiji had to walk two hundred and forty miles to reach Dandi, but it led the nation into a prolonged agitation for two and a half years.

Gandhiji's choice in 1920 led to temporary chaos, anarchy and disorder, as the resultant evils of the boycott of education, courts and legislature, in preference to the disgraceful bondage to the British. The boycott of education was meant to bring national education into existence and the call to students was one of preparation. But the course before the students in 1930 was one of precipitating in a mass civil disobedience movement. In this regard, Gandhiji claimed that the life of a satyagrahi constituted a perfect education, which worked for freedom from organized tyranny through non-violence and truth. He claimed that "no father need feel the slightest anxiety about dedicating his son or daughter to what is after all the truest education that can be conceived in the existing circumstances of the country."[35] He pointed out that freedom might not come for another generation if the crisis could not be developed to the fullest extent, supported by action. So he exhorted them to take the final plunge "not by empty meaningless cries but by a mute dignified unchallengeable action worthy of students."[36] It was on a similar line that Jawaharlal Nehru made to the students, the clarion call for Indian freedom. In a famous hand-bill entitled "Inquilab Zindabad," he asked them: "What shall it profit you to get your empty degrees and your mess of pottage if the millions starve and your motherland continues in bondage? Who lives if India dies? Who dies if India lives?"[37]

At the instigation of Mrs Lakshmipathi, the President of the Madras Youth League, resolutions were passed at the League's meeting held on 20 January approving the declarations of complete independence and the boycott of legislatures. At the Lahore Congress session Lakshmipathi could assimilate some of the spirit underlying the above declarations. But it took a long time for the Executive Committee of the League to follow the same. But at a meeting of the Madras League

of Youth held on 1 July resolutions appealing for cooperation with the Swadeshi League, condemning the Simon Report and congratulating those members of the League who had been convicted for participating in the civil disobedience campaign, were passed.[38]

On the eve of the declaration of civil disobedience, hasty changes occurred in the leadership of the TNCC presidentship, and Rajagopalachari was reinstated in April 1930, and T.S.S. Rajan became the party secretary.[39] The task of giving a direction to the Salt Satyagraha fell on the shoulders of Rajagopalachari, who concentrated more on the spirit of the movement rather than on the letter of the salt law. Vedaranyam in Tanjore district was his destination. Necessary spadework in anticipation of the Satyagraha was done under the auspices of the League of Youth. Through meetings, pamphlets, etc., the political atmosphere was electrified. Under the guidance of Dr B. Subha Rao, its secretary, volunteers in large numbers were enrolled. P.S. Bhashyam Chetti alone could enlist fifty volunteers. With a selected batch of 100 volunteers, most of whom were students and youngsters, he reached Vedaranyam on 28 April. The first group to break the salt law, at Vedaranyam, included Dr B. Subha Rao and K. Vinayaka Rao. The warm reception given to C. Rajagopalachari in Tanjore district was due to the untiring propaganda work done by Mrs Lakshmipathi, the president of the League. After the arrest of C. Rajagopalachari for breaking salt laws on 30 April, she became the TNCC president and got herself arrested for leading the volunteers at Vadaranyam. Subha Rao and Vinayaka Rao proceeded to join the campaign in the Madras city, and they too were imprisoned. P.S. Bhashyam Chetti went to Bombay where he studied the work of the Congress organization to create public impression. He shared the experience, gained at Bombay, with the political section of the League of Youth in a lecture addressed to them on 23 October.[40] In the period between 1929-30, 23 students from Madras Presidency, including a few from the Pachaiyappa's College, left the colleges to take part in the civil disobedience movement.[41] Three persons, M. Vinayagan, S.T.V. Sarma and Markandayan, were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment for defying the ban order prohibiting the holding of a meeting by the members of the Madras National Volunteer Corps.[42]

Many volunteers from Kerala participated in the war against the salt law, at Dandi, Vedaranyam and elsewhere.[43] The Kerala Provincial Congress Committee at its meeting on 9 March 1930, held at Badagara in north Malabar, chose Payyannur to be its venue for the enactment

of the salt satyagraha. The decision was enthusiastically received by young and old from all over Kerala, who came forward to enrol themselves as volunteers. The 'Kerala Yuvak Sangh' met in March and exhorted the youth to participate in the campaign. In the satyagraha camp held at Verkot House in Calicut on 10 April, the satyagrahi volunteers from every nook and corner of Kerala were given proper training by the Kerala Yuvak Sangh. Two batches, one led by Kelappan and the other by T.R. Krishnaswamy Iyer, broke the salt law at Payyannur beach on 23 April and 25 April respectively. Payyannur was re-enacted at Kunhimangalam and Karivallur, and later at twenty-seven places on the Calicut beach.[44] In Kerala, as elsewhere in India, the intensity of the civil disobedience movement increased in proportion to the mounting repression by the government. Students in large numbers enrolled themselves as volunteers in the salt satyagraha and later participated in the picketing of shops selling foreign goods, and liquor shops. E.M.S. Namboodiripad, a young student during that period and later the leader of the Marxist Party, speaks how these developments stirred up the student community: "A sense of duty and patriotism arose in many of us that we should not keep quiet by simply getting excited and thrilled through newspaper reports alone; we should also directly participate in that. In Trichur, a lady teacher by name Karthyayani Amma, resigned her job and joined the salt satyagraha. Some of us who were at the railway station to see her off, seriously pondered why we should also not follow suit."[45] Large numbers of students, thus stirred up to join the vortex of the campaign against the salt law,[46] met with brutal repression at the hands of the police. Such incidents were numerous. The procession of satyagrahi volunteers on their way to Calicut beach on 22 June, was harshly dealt with by the police, and, later, many of them were arrested and sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment. In this, the ordeal undergone by P. Kuttikrishna Panikkar, a student of Ganpat High School, attained to epic heights. He was mercilessly beaten and kicked and then arrested. On his release from jail, "he addressed a public meeting at the Calicut beach, whereupon a large contingent of armed police under five officers rushed to the spot. The police made a charge on the crowd and singled out Mr Panikkar and beat him mercilessly until he fell down unconscious."[47] He was taken into custody. When brought to trial before the Sub-divisional Magistrate, he told him that he had received more than 150 blows from the police. He was fatally ill, and, on the advice of his friends and relatives assembled in the court hall, he was

reluctantly let off by the court for six months. After a few days, he succumbed to the internal injuries he had sustained in the police persecution. The news of his demise saddened the hearts of the students of Calicut who observed hartal to honour the name of the martyr. M.P. Govindan Nambiar was another student volunteer to court arrest at Payyannur. He refused to give the police any undertaking as to his future conduct, and expressed his resolute desire to offer satyagraha again and again.[48] This landed him in prison for a month. The repressive policy of the government was much resented by the students. The students of the Ganpat High School, the Malabar Christian College, the Zamorin's College and the Himayathul Muslim High School, Calicut, assembled near Zamorin's College and warned the government of severe consequences for their repressive measures.

In the heat of the movement, the youth and the student community, who came out of the educational institutions to work out the Congress programme, met on 12 October 1930 and founded an organization called "Bala Bharat Seva Sangham."[49] Students below 18, from the various educational institutions in Calicut, formed its members. This organization served as a model for their counterparts elsewhere, where twelve organizations were formed on similar lines. These organizations helped the Congress to carry out its programmes such as picketing of foreign shops, propagation of swadeshi, distribution of pamphlets, etc.[50]

A section of members of the Youth League in Madras contributed their mite towards swadeshi, and boycott work involving: persuading the importers and dealers in foreign piece-goods to desist from further imports and sale; rousing of swadeshi spirit by educating the people through leaflets, meetings, processions and talks; popularizing the swadeshi spirit by itinerant exhibitions of swadeshi products and organization of shops in important centres; and preparing a blacklist of firms which did not abide by the swadeshi pledges, and picketing of dealers of videshi goods and their consumers.[51] For carrying out these items, organization and manpower were needed. The League of Youth appealed to the enthusiasm and sincerity of the youth who had already received university education, and expected to enlist 20,000 students who had retired home for the summer recess for volunteer work.[52]

When the decision to go ahead with swadeshi propaganda in the forefront of the League's activities was made, the Swadeshi Sub-Committee of the League was pressed into activity towards "gaining converts to the boycott of foreign goods," from among the youths in general

and the students in particular. The prominent members of the Swadeshi Sub-committee included Pandit Avadhanand (Hindi Pracharak), John P. Joshua (Professor of the Madras Christian College), R. Parthasarathy (former convenor of the Swadeshi Sub-committee of the Youth League and Manager of the Madras Branch of the All India Spinners' Association), A.R.V. Achar (Secretary of the Madras Swadeshi League), K. Narayanan (of *The Hindu* office), and the newly elected convenor, K.S. Venkataraman (acting Professor of Economics, Madras University). The colleges in the city of Madras which received the attention of the Youth Leaguers were Loyola College, Pachaiyappa's College, and Christian College.

Neither picketing nor the proposal to hawk swadeshi articles, particularly stationery, in front of the educational institutions, received much acceptance from the Youth Leaguers. But the idea of opening a stall for the sale of swadeshi articles in a centrally situated part of the city was considered to be a better method of spreading the swadeshi ideal. Swadeshi notebooks, priced at four annas nine pies each, were on sale in large numbers among college and school students.

The Swadeshi League was non-political in its objective. It sought to "promote Indian industry by urging abstinence from the purchase of all foreign goods and not specifically of British goods."[53] Dr A.G. Hogg, Principal, Madras Christian College, was full of pride of J.P. Joshua, a member of the staff of his college, who sought "eagerly and with a considerable degree of success, to divert Youth League activities from political into social and economic channels."[54] Joshua was of the view that the "most effective way of preventing students from expressing their patriotic feelings in undesirably political activities, would be by devising for them ways of self-sacrificing effort for the social and economic uplift of their country."[55] He was also of opinion that students must find some way of patriotic self-expression other than increased conscientiousness of study. This should be achieved along social and economic, not political, channels. When the attitude of Joshua towards the League was questioned by the government, especially since he was appointed in a committee of the Swadeshi League to prepare a Directory of Indian goods, the Principal of the Christian College came to his defence. He argued that though "the keenness of his nationalism should lead him into occasional indiscretions, it has the compensating advantage of preventing students from discounting his sympathy with our college attitude by setting it down to lack of patriotism."[56]

The Congress propaganda among students was still alive as shown

by the successful turnout of the efforts of V.A. Sundaram, a popular agitator from Madras, to picket the three colleges in the Trichinopoly town.[57] Though he escaped from the hands of the police, the arrest of a number of persons frustrated the movement initiated by him.[58] Students of the Trichinopoly colleges were exhorted to quit colleges and observe hartal on 5 September 1930. A few cyclostyled sheets drafted and signed by T. Sadasivam, urging the students to join the national movement, were circulated before his arrest on 4 September 1930.[59] Mahalingam Aiyer, a Vakil of Coimbatore, was also found among students, to stimulate the revival of the boycott of the colleges. As a result, Paul Ramaswami of the Montgomery Hostel, a B.A. student in the Bishop Heber College, Ramachandra Nedungadi of Palghat, an undergraduate of the National College, Trichinopoly, and S. Sundaram, a secondary school student, enlisted themselves as volunteers. These student volunteers distributed leaflets, announcing a meeting in front of the Town Hall, Trichinopoly, on 6 September 1930. This leaflet also surveyed the political situation in Trichinopoly and questioned the legality of the trial and conviction of the volunteers on 4 and 5 September 1930.[60] The Town Hall meeting was attended by a crowd, 1,000 strong, most of them students. It was announced to hold a national flag procession the next day. The youth of the town were fervently called upon to join the movement and the students were exhorted to suspend their studies.

Students in Trichy were over-enthusiastic to throng at meetings and participate in the movement in defiance of the college and hostel rules. Hostels were decorated with national flags on 7 September 1930. A procession including a large number of students ended with an open-air meeting, outside the Town Hall, in the evening. Forceful dispersal was the policy adopted by the government to deal with such "crowds of demonstrators assembled in pursuance of the civil disobedience movement whether to parade in procession or to listen to an agitator's speech or to indulge in picketing."[61] The local authorities, who had been waiting for a favourable opportunity to take a resolute line of action, were soon to deal with the developments, by prohibiting picketing and by a raid of the volunteer camp.[62] Four students were arrested for picketing in defiance of the order. Apart from Trichinopoly and Bhimavaram, South Madura too witnessed student unrest. For trying to start propaganda in some villages of Bhimavaram, three volunteers were prosecuted and convicted on 5 September 1930 and were sentenced to six months R.I. and six months S.I. to run concurrently.[63]

Three other volunteers turned up at Bhimavaram defying the ban on the day when the above three volunteers were tried. As they collected a crowd, they were promptly dispersed by the police. At Bodinayakkanur in the Madura district, picketing of toddy shops was revived. In two days, 34 volunteers participated in the picketing and were arrested. Except two, all these volunteers were outsiders.

Trouble followed when some of the boys at the Hindu High School, Triplicane, decided to celebrate 15 September 1930, as "Gandhi Cap Day." A number of them came to school with a supply of caps. They wore caps themselves and attempted to force others to wear them especially by bullying the sons of government officials.[64] This brought much confusion in all the classrooms. Later, after the lunch interval, they collected a crowd and left the school in procession with a national flag. They resisted the police who turned out to stop them, and were dispersed by the police subsequently. The trouble continued the next day and spread to the Kellet High School in Triplicane. This necessitated the intervention of the police who dispersed the procession and arrested 25 students and nine outsiders.[65] They were released after admonition. On 5 October, a meeting of the parents of the ten boys, who had taken part in the school disturbances, was held. A statement showing the behaviour of these boys during the disturbances was read out. Taking into account the gravity of the offence committed, it was resolved to punish the boys in the following manner. "Three of the ten boys should be suspended from school for a fortnight. Two others should be fined two rupees each. The remaining five should be fined rupee one each."[66]

Attempts by students to observe hartal on 16 November 1930 were foiled when 37 members of the National Volunteer Corps were arrested for distributing notices calling for the said action. Though this hindered the observance of the hartal, the remaining volunteers, however, attempted to take out a procession reinforced by a number of satyagrahis who had just returned from jail. This too did not take place, since it was prohibited by the City Commissioner of Police. A batch of ten more volunteers were arrested. The arrest and conviction of Ganapathy, the leader of the Volunteer Corps, fell heavily upon its activities.[67] In the face of this repressive policy of the government, it was resolved to form a "Council of Action," under the aegis of Satyamurthi, to check the decline of youth activities. The League of Youth, which was inactive for some time, held a meeting on 17 November, under the stimulation of the Council of Action. Then it resolved

to celebrate the Concord Day and resume the publication of its journal, the *Voice of Youth*. Owing to inadequate finance and poor following, the Council of Action had only a sickly beginning. Satyamurthy was left alone in his work when three of its five members were imprisoned and another resigned.[68] This retarded the activities of the Action Council.

Flag salutation ceremony and 'Independence Day' were celebrated in the city of Madras by the local Congress organization. Absence of any prohibitory order and the news about the imminent release of Gandhiji and other leaders increased the intensity of work for an effective demonstration and complete hartal on 26 January.[69] The volunteers commenced the day's celebration by persuading shop and bazaar keepers to close their business that day. Persuasion turned into coercion and intimidation of shopkeepers. Throwing stones at shops kept open, interference with vehicular traffic, and the gathering of disorderly crowds formed the dominant features which marred the 'peaceful nature' of the hartal.[70] Picketing of schools and colleges formed an important programme. In this, the participation of the students of the city was considerable. While students of some of the educational institutions were able to force their authorities to declare that day a holiday, the distrurbance that had erupted in Pachaiyappa's College began to flare up. On 26 January 1931, some of the senior students of Pachaiyappa's College wanted the Principal to close the school and college for the day in honour of the release of the leaders. The attendance was fairly strong, and the students were found in their respective classes. The advice of the Principal to take some other day for a holiday fell on deaf ears, as the students had gathered to demand the declaration of a holiday as given by Christian College and other institutions. The Principal met the demand of the students by declaring holiday for the day and watched them leaving in an orderly manner. Students were making some noise but were non-violent. Suddenly policemen entered the campus, after assaulting the watchman at the gate, and charged against students. The students ran helter-skelter and took asylum in the central hall of the college. The Secretary of students' union of Pachaiyappa's College reported that more than five students had sustained serious injuries. Krishnamachari, a third year student, was taken to the General Hospital. Raja, an innocent boy, was beaten so severely that he became unconscious. The Principal disapproved of the presumption that his boys took an active part "in throwing shoes, bottles, brickbats etc., as alleged by the Home Member."[71]

From this statement, it is clear that the boys had been

"ungenerously"heard by the government. The College Union Secretary questioned the authority of the police to enter the premises and beat the students indiscriminately. Likewise, the Principal argued that the police could have easily made representation to him so that he could have taken the necessary steps to clear the terrace of undesirable elements.

The police lathi-charges invited a lot of criticism in the Congress circles. Protesting against the police lathi-charge, the students of the Madras Law College, numbering about a hundred, went in an orderly procession on 7 February. However, the Principal of the Law College stated that "beyond the fact that the procession started from the gates of the Law College, it had no connection with the College whatever."[72] The processionists included many junior vakils and students of other colleges, but they were easily taken for Law College students.

When the non-cooperation movement brought into its fold a large number of students, the civil disobedience movement brought to the field some educational institutions which claimed an unblemished record of political non-involvement. The Canara High School, Mangalore, was one among them. It claimed that "none of the teachers nor any of the members of the management have taken part in any anti-government movement."[73] For the 'wrong' of participating in the non-cooperation movement, a teacher, who left the school in 1921, was removed from service. He was never readmitted in spite of his repeated efforts. Besides, the school had the precedence of taking extreme measures such as dismissal, when they were called for. A son of one of the richest merchants of Mangalore was dismissed for participating in a procession, and the District Magistrate had to intervene to effect his readmission. The authorities of this school with such a record were soon to take disciplinary measures when it saw signs of students showing interest in politics. K. Narahari Baliga, who was found actively dissuading boys from attending school on 5 January 1932, was deprived of his scholarship. He had to tender a written apology to get permission to attend the school. The scholarship rules stood amended, by making participation of a scholarship holder in political demonstrations as a ground for the forfeiture of scholarship.[74] A combined letter of the Manger and the Headmaster of the Canara High School was addressed to the parents telling them about the severe consequences, if their wards took part in political meetings and processions. Students, who got themselves involved in politics in contravention of the prohibition made in the educational rules, were to be expelled or punished by

courts for breach of laws or orders of government. The cooperation of the parents was sought to warn their boys against participation in political activities and to "guide them right in the interest of their future careers."[75]

The local schoolboys of the Board High School, Kalahasti, in response to the call for hartal by the Congress workers in the town, stayed away from school on 5 January 1932. Their attempt to start a procession was foiled by the prompt and effective action of the headmaster, and they made no further attempt. The pupils were individually warned and reminded of "the serious nature of their action in having participated in the hartal." A memo was sent round by the headmaster warning the puplis against the repetition of their action. It observed: "Pupils of educational institutions should not take part in any form of political activities .... The undersigned is also aware that most of them were compelled to yield to threat or pressure and therefore takes a sympathetic view of the matter in their behalf, though serious."[76]

In Anantapur College, only about 40 out of 300 students attended the college in January 1932. Students gathered in the hostel compound and seriously discussed the next step to be taken. The Deputy Superintendent of Police advised the students against participating in politics and warned them of severe action.

The hartal of 26 February 1932 was the first of its kind in the history of the Government College, Mangalore. Many such demonstrations had been organized in other institutions in and outside Mangalore, before. But the Principal claimed that he was able to leave his college unaffected by preventing his students from joining them, by timely warnings. Since the hartal of 26 February 1932 was organized by the circulation of secret cyclostyled notices, the Principal could know about it only on the eve of the hartal. It was too late for him to "bring any influence to bear upon the students."[77]

In regard to the mass absenteeism of 26 February 1932, the Principal observed that the hartal was "organized as a protest against local police excesses, and was to this extent not 'political'. It is extraordinarily difficult to keep impressionable young minds from being influenced by tales of harrowing cruelty."[78] The fear that their children might be beaten in the streets, and not any desire that they should join the demonstration, made the parents dissuade their wards from attending college on the day of hartal.

The South Kanara Satyagraha Mandal organized the protest day on 26 February 1932 throughout the district. All the taluk centres ob-

served hartals. Even small bazaars in Udipi, Kundapur, Kasargode, Bantval, Gurpur, Bajpekateel, Kinnigoli, Puthur and several other places, were not spared.

The Congressmen and their sympathisers fixed 26 February 1932 for demonstrations "according to one version, to protest against the alleged police excess in the district; according to another, to protest against the Government of India's policy, and according to yet another, to celebrate the political sufferers' day."[79] However, in Mangalore town, the hartal was complete and the student absenteeism in the schools and colleges was an additional item of the programme.[80]

26 February 1932 was regarded as an auspicious day for marriages and "upanayanams." The number of absentees on that day at the Canara High School, Mangalore, was 100. The leave notes obtained were suspected to be lame excuses and left the authorities to use other means to find the politically motivated absentees. They presumed all those who were absent on both 5 January[81] and 26 February 1932 to be politically motivated absentees, and fined each of them 8 annas.[82] A notice detailing the serious nature of disciplinary measures against boys associating with political causes was issued by the manager of the school to boys and parents at the beginning of the school year itself. Its effect was proved on 4 July 1932, the "All Prisoners' Day", a hartal day, when political absenteeism was found to be nil. This notice was to be applied only to the ordinary run of boys and the top leaders were easily separated.

"The student cannot be regarded solely as an individual. He is a member of a corporate institution, and in the interests of the institution, and not with the object of imposing any indignity on the individual, it is often necessary, to make conditions which will secure discipline."[83] These were the considerations held by some provincial governments in making conditional the re-entry of student politicians, to the government and aided educational institutions. Some provincial educational codes or rules prescribed a form of application on which the parent or guardian should affix his signature at the time of admission of his son or ward.

In the United Provinces and also in Central India, "a declaration has to be signed by the parent or guardian to the effect that he agrees to abide by the rules of the department as laid down in the educational code."[84] In the Government College, Lahore, before getting admitted, every student had to furnish the following declaration in his application. "I promise not to take part in any political action of any kind whilst

a student."[85] The DPI, Assam, issued a circular on 19 May 1930, requiring the parents or guardians of boys attending govenment or aided High Schools in the province, to sign a declaration that their boys would take no active part in political propaganda and that any deliberate breach of this undertaking would result in the expulsion of the offender. The circular which came to be called after the name of the Director, Cunningham, was meant to be a precautionary measure against those "immature minds" falling an "easy prey to the unscrupulous agitators." In Madras, the circular issued by the DPI to principals of all Government Colleges on the subject of student politics, emphasized the role of the principals in "protecting the students from the effects of propaganda designed to betray them into acts of indiscipline and excess."[86] The steps suggested for mintaining the right spirit in the college were the "personal influence of members of the staff on parents and guardians as well as on students, and, in particular, the tutorial system."[87] Student participation in political agitations was to be dissuaded by the principal and, in this, students as well as their guardians, were to be made aware that "severe disciplinary action will follow all instancess in which it is proved that students have taken part in political agitation or have absented themselves from school or college as a protest against the action or policy of Government."[88] The punishments were to be adequate and severe and were to take one of two forms—either fine or expulsion from the college. But no undertaking requiring the adherence to rules was required from the parents or guardians in provinces like Madras, Bengal and North-West Frontier Province.

The civil disobedience movement was discontinued for a shortwhile after the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, signed in March 1931.[89] Though the Karachi Congress approved it, the student community was disappointed about the outcome. The Gandhi-Irwin Pact was short of their expectations. So far, they had involved themselves in the Congress programme whole-heartedly. But for the first time, the pact compelled them to take sides in a national controversy. They expressed their disapproval at the All-India Youth Congress, held at Karachi in 1931. The pact miserably failed to include the cause of the students, who were the active participants in the civil disobedience campaign. The Government of India did not consider it a "very onerous obligation when the boys were required to undertake to observe disciplinary rules of the institutions."[90] In a memorandum given to Mr Emerson, Gandhiji pointed out that in Assam, Ahmedabad, Ankola (Kanur district),

Ajmer-Merwara, UP and Delhi, all sorts of undertakings were demanded for admission of boys and girls, who participated in the civil disobedience campaign. In the September 1930 session of the Assam Legislative Council, a resolution was moved, advocating that the Cunningham circular should be withdrawn, and that instructions should be given to all school authorities to readmit pupils unconditionally. Opposing the resolution, the DPI pointed out that the government could not permit its schools to be used as a nursery of disorder and sedition at a time of revolutionary activity. With the discontinuance of the political programme and the lightening of the disciplinary measures, the student community began to return to their educational institutions. A grain of displeasure with the Gandhi-Irwin Pact generated in some students shapeless doubts about the Gandhian methods. New political elements began to influence them. For a few years they remained quiet, only to emerge with a political image of their own.

The civil disobedience movement could not bring independence to India. To Gandhiji, the call of 1920 was a call for preparation but that of the 1930s was for engaging in a final conflict.[91] Successive events starting from the governmental repression against the anti-Simon demonstration, Congress decision for complete imdependence, Gandhiji's ultimatum for dominion status before 31 December 1929 or civil disobedience movement for complete independence, successful turn out of the Bardoli satyagraha and the world depression of 1930, made the Congress resolute in its steps and fired the Indian sentiments towards the struggle for freedom.

This period also witnessed the assumption of responsibilities by the generation who were either students during the non-cooperation movement or participants in the Congress movements during 1920s. To K.M. Panikkar, this period witnessed the "protest of the children against the fathers."[92] The leaders of this new generation, which came to the forefront of the nationalist agitation, were Jawaharlal Nehru, Subhas Chandra Bose, Yousuf Meherally, K.F. Nariman and Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya. In South India, the leaders were K. Kamaraja Nadar, P.S. Kumaraswami Raja, Satyamurthy, Santhanam, Prakasam, etc. But this period also witnessed a compromise of the fathers with the views of their children. Motilal Nehru and Gandhiji represented the former, and Jawaharlal Nehru represented the latter. The Independence resolution, though accepted was not taken seriously in the beginning. This was because the resolution came from Jawaharlal Nehru, a youngster at that time. Gandhiji, though he characterised the

resolution as a "school boy's business,"[93] wanted to compromise with Nehru and the generation which he represented. The young activists served as a second line of leadership when the government took action against the prominent Congress leaders.[94] It was under this leadershp that the youth and students of the country found a favourable guidance to their activities. The Congress programmes of the 1920s, with a few modifications, found their continuance in the civil disobedience movement. The boycott of governmental institutions was not emphasized in the second civil disobedience movement of 1932-34.[95] But the celebrations such as Independence day, Flag salutation day, Universal temperance week, Gandhi cap day, Concord day, All-prisoners' day, Political sufferers' day, apart from the usual programmes such as picketing, hartal and boycott, caused much excitement among students, resulting in their large-scale participation. The melee that followed the confrontation of the students with the police invited the concern of their parents and relatives in the villages, thus linking a rural population to the main channel of nationalist politics. The civil disobedience movement also reached the educational institutions which had hitherto remained aloof from the national politics. These factors helped to broaden the base of the student activism to new dimensions, only to be consolidated at the right hour.

Notes and References

1. P.D. Kaushik, *The Congress Ideology and Programme*, 1920-47, p. 234.
2. *Fortnightly Reports*, 1 February 1929.
3. *Ibid.*, 18 February 1929.
4. G.O. No. 600, Public Department (Confidential), 25 May 1929, TNA.
5. M.G. Naidu, *Appeal to the Students of the Madras Province*, (Hand-bill), dated 22 January 1928.
6. P. Rajeswara Rao, *T. Prakasam*, p. 236.
7. G.O. No. 166, Public Department, 23 February 1928, TNA.
8. G.O. No. 600, Public Department, (Confidential), May 25, 1929, TNA.
9. MNNR, *Mysore Star*, 1926 February 1929; *Satyagrahi*, 25 February 1929; *Mathrubhumi*, 26 February 1929.
10. Introductory letter from the Chief Secretary to the District Magistrate of East and West Godavari, Kistna and Guntur, USS File (Secret), No. 774, 12 October 1931, TNA.
11. Vide Confidential letter from the Commissioner's office, Madras City Police dated 11 June 1930 to Under Secretary to Government, Nilgiri, *Ibid.*

12. MNNR, *Congress*, 28 May 1929.
13. Subhas Chandra Bose, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-189.
14. Letter from the Government of India to the C.S. to the Government of Madras, 21 February 1929, USS File (Confidential), No. 613, 14 March 1929, TNA.
15. Letter from the Government of India to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, 24 June 1929, *Ibid.*
16. Jawaharlal Nehru, *An Autobiography*, pp. 120-121; Frank Moraes, *Jawaharlal Nehru*, p. 100.
17. *Report of the thirty-eighth session of the Indian National Congress* – 1923, pp. 118-119.
18. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *op.cit.*, p. 346.
19. G.S. Halappa, *History of the Freedom Movement in Karnataka*, Vol. II, p. 446; also Jamila Brijbhushan, *Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya*, pp. 29-30.
20. Letter from the Secretary to the Government of India to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, USS File (Confidential), No. 613, 14 March 1929, TNA.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Fortnightly Reports*, 1 August 1929.
23. *Ibid.*, 18 November 1929.
24. *Ibid.*, 2 December 1929.
25. *Ibid.*, 18 November 1929.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*, 6 January 1930.
28. *Ibid.*, 17 January 1930.
29. See Sarvepalli Gopal, *Jawaharlal Nehru, A Biography,* Vol. I, pp. 110–113, see Mitra, *op. cit.*, 1927, Vol. II, pp. 380–381; presiding over the All-Bengal Students' Conference on September 1928, Jawaharlal Nehru advocated complete independence for India.
30. J.N. Vajpeyi, *The Extremist Movement in India*, pp. 307–314.
31. Speaking at the third session of the All-India Youth Congress, Calcutta, on 25 December 1928 Subhas Chandra Bose declared that "the youth of India are no longer content with handing over all responsibilfty to their elder leaders and sitting with folded hands or following like dumb driven cattle. They have realised that it is for them to create a new India – free, great and powerful." Publications Division, *Selected Speeches of Subhas Chandra Bose*, p. 43; also Judith M. Brown, *Gandhi and Civil Disobedience—The Mahatma in Indian Politics*, 1928–34.
32. Michael Edwardes, *Nehru, A Political Biography*, p. 70.
33. D.A. Low, *op. cit.*, p. 145.
34. *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Vol. 43, pp. 2–8.
35. Mahatma Gandhi, Choice Before Students (a handbill circulated by the Secretary, TNCC Coimbatore), TNA; G.O. No. 1188, Public Department

(General), Misc. Series (Confidential), 10 September 1930, TNA; also *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, 42, pp. 109–111.

36. *Ibid.*
37. 'Inquilab Zindabad'; *Ibid.*; D.G. Tendulkar, *Mahatma; Life of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi*, Vol. 5. pp. 31–34; Michael Brecher, *op. cit.*, p. 150.
38. *Fortnightly Reports*, 17 July 1930.
39. *The Hindu*, 4 April 1930.
40. Strictly Confidential letter from Special Branch of CID, 31 October 1930 to the IGP, USS File No. 699-G. 1930, p. 65, TNA.
41. Confidential letter from the DPI, 27 October 1930 to the Deputy Secretary to Government L.E. Department, *Ibid.*
42. Confidential letter from the Police Commissioner's Office, 10 November 1930 to the Under Secretary, *Ibid.*
43. C. Krishnan Nair of Travancore volunteered in the first batch to Dandi led by Gandhiji. G. Ramachandran, Swami Ananda Tirth were the prominent volunteers from Kerala to participate in the breach of the salt law held at Vedaranyam camp, led by C. Rajagopalachari.
44. P.K.K. Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 187.
45. E.M.S Namboodiripad, *How I Became a Communist*, p. 113; also *Atmakatha* (M.), pp. 245–246.
46. See A.K. Gopalan, *In the cause of the People*, p. 15.
47. P.K.K. Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 202.
48. *Ibid.*
49. A.K. Pillai, *Congressum Keralavum*, p. 533; also P.K.K. Menon, *op. cit.*, pp. 223–224.
50. *Ibid.*
51. *Voice of Youth*, Vol. I, No. 11, 14 May 1930.
52. *Ibid.*
53. Letter dated 20 July 1930 from Dr A.G. Hogg, Principal, Madras Christian College, USS File No. 705, 29 August 1930, TNA.
54. *Ibid.*
55. *Ibid.*
56. Confidential letter from Dr H.G. Hogg, Principal, Madras Christian College, 18 July 1931, *Ibid.*
57. For a detailed list of students who left colleges to take part in civil disobedience movement, see confidential letter from the DPI, 27 October 1930 to the Deputy Secretary to Government L.E. Department, USS File, 699-G/1930, TNA.
58. *Fortnightly Reports*, 17 September 1930.
59. USS File No. 745, 12 October 1931, TNA.
60. *Ibid.*
61. *Ibid.*

62. *Fortnightly Reports*, 17 September 1930.
63. USS File No. 745, 12 October 1931, TNA.
64. Confidential letter from Commissioner's office, Madras City Police, Egmore, 16 September 1930 to the Chief Secretary, USS File No. 683, 27 July 1930, TNA.
65. *Fortnightly Reports*, 3 October 1930.
66. Letter from M.R. Dy. P.A. Subramonia Ayyar Avl., Headmaster, Hindu High School, Triplicane, USS File, 27 July 1930, No. 683, TNA.
67. *Fortnightly Reports*, 18 December 1930.
68. *Ibid.*
69. Extract from the fortnightly report of the Commissioner of Police, Madras, 30 January 1931, G.O. No. 984, Education Department, Misc. Series, 6 June 1931, TNA.
70. *Ibid.*
71. Letter No. 353, 12 February 1931 from the Principal Pachaiyappa's College, Madras, *Ibid.*
72. Extract from the fortnightly report from the DIG of Police, Railways and CID, Madras, 14 February 1931, *Ibid.*
73. Letter, 25 July 1932 from the Correspondent, Canara High School, Mangalore, to the District Educational Officer, South Canara, G.O. No. 1254, Education Department, Confidential, 29 August 1932, TNA.
74. *Ibid.*
75. Private letter, 15 January 1932, *Ibid.*
76. Copy of Memo No. 36, 6 January 1932 issued by the Headmaster; Board High School, Kalahasti, *Ibid.*
77. *Ibid.*
78. Copy of D.O., 24 April 1932 from the Principal, Government College, Mangalore, *Ibid.*
79. Confidential letter 21/32, 8 March 1932, from the District Magistrate of South Canara, *Ibid.*
80. *Swarajya*, 2 March 1932.
81. On 5 January 1932 a futile attempt at mass absenteeism was made on account of Gandhi's arrest.
82. Letter from the Correspondent, Canara High School, Mangalore, to the District Educational Officer, South Canara, 25 July 1932, G.O. No. 1254, Education Department, Confidential, 29 August 1932. TNA.
83. Letter sent to M.K. Gandhi by the Government of India, Simla, 2 July 1931, File No. 33/20/31-Pol., Home Department, NAI.
84. *Ibid.*
85. *Ibid.*
86. CL. No. 9/32, 5 May 1932, G.O. No. 1254, Education Department (Confidential), 29 August 1932, TNA.
87. *Ibid.*

88. *Ibid.*
89. For the text of the Provisional settlement, see *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Vol. 45, pp. 432–436; C.H. Philips, *The Evolution of India and Pakistan 1858 to 1947*, pp. 241–242.
90. Extract from a note of discussion, 20 May 1931, between His Excellency Sir Malcolm Hailey, Governor of the United Provinces and Gandhiji, Home, Pol. Department File No. 33/20/31, NAI.
91. D.G. Tendulkar, *Mahatma*, Vol. III, p. 40; also see, P.K.K. Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 181.
92. K.M. Panikkar, *Asia and Western Dominance*, p. 338.
93. G. Rudrayya Chowdari, *Prakasam, A Political Study*, p. 47.
94. D.A. Low, *op. cit.*, p. 270.
95. C.Y. Chintamani, *Indian Politics Since the Mutiny*, p. 101.

Chapter 7

Prelude to Quit India Movement

THOUSANDS of students who participated in the civil disobedience movement had to go back to their textbooks and classrooms with the return of normalcy. This gave the national leaders time to consolidate the forces of revolution. With the successful turnout of the student movement in Russia, China, Egypt and elsewhere, there emerged the idea of harnessing juvenile energy and the idealism of the students. The adoption of radical measures for the improvement of volunteer organizations, in tune with the changing needs of the time, was a step towards this. Though the Hindustani Seva Dal played a glorious part in the civil disobedience movement, it failed to achieve the desired effect owing to the laxity in discipline and the existence of unauthorised volunteer groups in many parts of the country, lacking in uniform training or organization. This caught the attention of the Congress Working Committee, which, by a resolution on 11 July 1931, recognised the Hindustani Seva Dal as the Central Volunteer Organization. This made the Seva Dal part and parcel of the Congress, and brought the volunteers under the direct command of the Congress Working Committee. By the same resolution, Jawaharlal Nehru was appointed the member-in-charge, and Hardikar, the Organizing Secretary, of the Dal. Under the stewardship of Jawaharlal Nehru, the organization was enlarged and its activities were made dynamic.

Nehru prepared elaborate rules and regulations supplementing the Congress resolution and circulated them to the Provincial Congress Committees for perusal. This circular required a permanent All-India Corps of Volunteers at its headquarters, and a few institutions to train officers and instructors. Provincial Congress Committees were given autonomy in the matter of organizing volunteers, while the headquarters maintained the power of general supervision in regard to the training and technique of organization. The circular required all officers and instructors to be trained and certified, and all volunteers to be members of the Congress who conformed by pledge to the Congress creed.[1] Rules for the Seva Dal debarred volunteers from belonging to any communal or political organization. In elucidating the idea con-

tained in the rules, Nehru observed that "the volunteer must feel that his chief function is volunteering and his organization is the Congress."[2] This bar was to make the volunteer efficient in the work he had undertaken to perform. The business of the Seva Dal was to train workers for the Congress, and its *Sainiks* and *Sainikas* and other workers were to remain prepared so as to carry out such work as might be entrusted to them by their PCCs.[3]

Paucity of public workers had been felt for long. Andhra stole a march, in remedying this, over the rest of India, when Prof. N.G. Ranga, one of the first ranking freedom-fighters of India, conceived the idea of imparting to young men training in public work. In this, he was greatly inspired by the folk schools of Scandinavian countries. The inauguration of the Indian Peasant Institute in the Rama-Needu Vidyalaya of Nidubrolu village by Gandhiji, in December 1933, marked a good beginning in this direction.[4] In organizing economic and political schools, student and youth conferences, summer schools and lecture sessions, N.G. Ranga was assisted by Mrs Ranga, Shrimati Rajya Laxmi Devi, and A. Kameshwar Rao.

Lectures given in these schools were of a Socialist and Communist type. Students were instructed to take active part in movements directed against capitalist and imperialist domination. The general tendency of the lecturers, who hailed from north India, was to "disparage the philosophy and practice of non-violence."[5] It was reported that the students were instructed in the "use of the general strike as a weapon to seize power and to capture key positions such as post-offices, armouries and banks."[6]

With the advent of May (1938), 'summer school' season dawned in the various Andhra districts as well as in Malabar. They were of distinct types. While the school at Kurnool was reported to be a 'Gandhian' one, the school at Guntur and Kistna were said to be of a Kisan-Communist character.[7] Some were opened and addressed by members of the government and visited by the district officers. On the other hand, the police were disallowed in some schools like the one at Ichchapur in Vizagapatam district, where subversive propaganda was suspected.

Under the influence of these political and economic schools in many rural districts of Andhra, the students and young men underwent their political baptism and thus a rural leadership was built up. Prof. N.G. Ranga claimed to have trained several hundreds of young men of both the districts of Rayalseema and Kalinga, by 1940.[8] This campaign of building up rural leadership came to be "the backbone of the rural

people's leadership of all Andhra, more especially of Rayalseema and Kalinga."[9]

Simultaneously with these efforts, the student movement in India, which started from a hunger for knowledge, was endeavouring to travel beyond the textbooks. A convention of students on an all-India basis was a long-cherished dream ever since the beginning of the All-Bihar Students' Conference, and the Madras Students' Convention. When the All-Bengal Students' Convention was held in September 1928, it proposed to constitute an All-India Students' Federation. The student movement in India had reached the maturity to start such a federation. The dream became a reality when the first All-India Students' Convention, held at Lahore on 30 December 1929, attended by students from all over India, resolved to form an All-India Students' Union. The AISU aimed at promoting "(a) physical, intellectual and moral development of students on national lines, (b) interest in the past of the country and (c) patriotism, education and sense of citizenship among students."[10] It also resolved to appoint organizing committees for the purpose of founding students' organizations in all the provinces and to hold the AISU session concurrently with the Congress session. Students' Conferences began to be held every year with the Congress session. Also the Students' Conference held at Karachi on 26 March 1931, under the Presidentship of Jawaharlal Nehru, expressed the desire to form an All-India Students' Federation and to establish student organizations in all provinces. But in the political upheaval that followed the civil disobedience movement, the government banned all student organizations. As in the earlier movements, the elder politicians propelled the youthful energy against British policy. When the civil disobedience movement came to a close, it was thought that the students should participate in the movement for national regeneration, in addition to their academic activities. This desire found expression when the Congress Working Committee met at Wardha on 12 and 13 June 1934, and adopted the resolution that "the working committee expects the student community to take their due share in the social, economic and educational part of the constructive programme of the Congress by devoting to it their spare hours, and particularly their vacation."[11]

The much-expected AISF came into being when, under the initiative of the students of the Swadeshi League and the UP Students' Federation, an All-India Students' Conference was convened at Lucknow on 19 August 1936. The Conference was inaugurated by Pandit Nehru and

was presided over by Muhammad Ali Jinnah. 986 delegates participated in the deliberations of the conference. In the address of Prem Bhargava, the chairman of the reception committee, the political leaning of the organizers was emphasised. This initiated a discussion on the role of students in politics. Nehru and Jinnah maintained that they should keep pace with politics. The aims and objectives of the organization were marked out to be "to prepare the students for citizenship, in order to take their due share in the struggle for complete national freedom, by arousing their political, social and economic consciousness."[12] The second conference held at Lahore on 22 November 1936, under the presidency of Sarat Chandra Bose, adopted a constitution and the AISF formally came into existence. This special session placed a host of demands before the seven state governments then under Congress rule: a reduction in fees, the introduction of free and compulsory education, the elimination of anti-national ideas from text-books, the use of vernacular languages as the media of instruction, compulsory recognition of students' unions by the universities, students representation on the governing bodies of universities, more vocational training, relief for the unemployed, travel concessions for students in trains and steamships, a ban on communal student organizations, an end to discrimination, free military training in schools and colleges, compulsory teaching of civics, economics and science at the level of secondary education, and the elimination of degrading punishments such as caning and beating.[13]

The first split in the AISF occurred in 1937, with the formation of All-India Muslim Students' Federation. The advisability of the formation of an organization for the Muslims on an all-India basis was discussed at the All-India Muslim Students' Conference held on 17 January 1937. Mushir Husain Kidwai, member of the Council of State, was in the chair. Muslim student representatives from various universities attended the deliberations. A resolution regarding the formation of an organization for the Muslims met with great opposition. However the protagonists of the organization held a separate meeting under the presidentship of Iftikar Hussain and decided to form an All-India Muslim Students' League.[14] In his presidential address at the AIMSC, held at Calcutta on 27 and 28 December 1937, Prof. Humayun Kabir opposed the formation of a separate Muslim organization under the caption AIMSF. He stated that the student community in the country was faced with two alternatives, that is, self-interest or the interest of the masses. Communal organizations satisfied the self-interest of only

a few individuals. He exhorted the Muslim students to work along with the other communities and endeavour to solve the common world problems.[15] But, in the AIMSC held in the Muslim League pandal in Patna on 29 December 1938, M.A. Jinnah, observed: "There were three forces in the country: the British, the States and the Congress. The time had now come to give a battle to all forces and the sooner young men made up their minds to do so, better for them"[16] and inaugurated the AIMSF. It was but strange to hear these words from a person who, in 1936, as the president of the first Session of AISF advised students not to go the communal way. However, the communal-minded Muslims who favoured the creation of Pakistan were soon to organise themselves, and they were active in Bengal, the Punjab, Bombay, Madras, United Provinces, Central Provinces, Delhi and Aligarh.

Participation in politics is one thing and affiliation with a political party is another. M.R. Masani, then a prominent socialist leader, summed up the position of the student in the political life of the country, in his presidential address delivered at the third AISF session held at Madras. He said that a political organization such as the AISF, where socialists, Gandhiites and nationalists worked in cooperation, could be political but not partisan. The political objective of the AISF was to train the students to take their due share in the struggle for freedom. He maintained that while such a body should not be allowed to become a political party, students of all shades of progressive thought should be admitted to it.[17] But the crucial test to the organization came, when a resolution praising the newly-inaugurated Soviet Constitution moved by P. Krishna Swamy (Guntur), was moved. A heated discussion ensued. M.L. Shah (Bombay) moved for the deletion of the last sentence relating to the inauguration of the constitution. He argued that the "election had not been conducted in a purely democratic way."[18] Anwar Harwani appealed the mover to withdraw his resolution, since, if passed, it would give an impression that the "student movement was for the benefit of one party."[19] The mover was about to withdraw his resolution, when he was prevented from it by a vote of the house. The events took a new turn when Masani dissolved the conference citing some procedural and constitutional difficulties.[20] The resolutioners convened a rump session, elected a new president, declared a vote of no-confidence against the President, the General Secretary and the members of the Working Committee, and passed the controversial resolution. The Communist bid to capture the student

movement failed, when the socialists and Gandhians met separately under the leadership of Masani, and declared their AISF to be the legitimate one. Both groups worked separately for several months. But prominent leftist Congress leaders patched up their differences and the precarious unity lasted for two more years. It again brought into its fold the prominent national leaders. In its Calcutta session held on 1 and 2 January 1939, Dr K.M. Ashraf, who later became a CPI leader, was the president. Sarat Chandra Bose opened the conference and Nehru addressed it. The spirit of the movement was maintained when the president of the conference said that the student movement in India was "essentially democratic and anti-imperialist in its nature and it has allied itself with the progressive youth of other countries. . . "[21] In the same strain Nehru said that the student movement should be broad-based and non-partisan, and never communal. The fifth session of the AISF was held at New Delhi on 1 January 1940, with Subhas Chandra Bose in the chair. M. Farooqui, the chairman of the reception committee, deplored the party bickerings within the Federation. For the strengthening of the student movement he suggested a two-point programme. "Firstly they must take up questions affecting the average student and agitate for the fulfilment of their demand through the students' federation. It was also advisable to organize study circles in schools and colleges with a view to creating political consciousness among students. Secondly, they must engage themselves in the uplift of the masses."[22] One of the resolutions passed in the conference sounded that the Second World War was not in the interest of the country.

At a time when India's fortune was linked with the swift changes in international relations, the leaders of the national struggle were called upon to take a crucial decision. So far, the leaders of the freedom struggle had been divided on the question of methods. But, with the outbreak of the Second World War, a drift in the interests of the parties involved in the national struggle set in. When the British imperialists were burning their fingers in the Second Great (imperialist versus fascist) war, they sought help from all sources. India was unilaterally dragged into the war by them. This unwarranted step, taken without respect for Indian public opinion, infuriated them to a great extent.

The Congress party, which had always followed a policy of waiting in matters of national politics, was divided in the matter of the action to be taken. Gandhiji, true to his philosophy, showed an attitude of sympathy with the British power, in its hour of grave peril.[23] Gandhiji

found India trapped between a known satan and an unknown devil. He was prepared to give his word of support to this known satan though the subsequent events in national as well as international politics and the failure of the Cripps mission, prompted him to have second thoughts.

The image of the Communist Party of India, too, was at stake in this period. Those patriots who were completely mesmerised by the success of the Russian Revolution and the rise of Russia as a great world power, were the champions of the Communist Party of India. No wonder, the CPI's attitude towards the war changed according to the interests of Russia. When England was faced with a threat of fascism, and France was facing an imminent Nazi assault, the Communist Party waved peace with Hitler. The agony of an immediate war against Russia was averted with the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between Russia and Germany. The party was firm in its aim and methods for the achievement of Swaraj, before Russia became a party to the war. The Indian leaders were humiliated when the British Government unanimously made India a party in their alien war fields. But the sole resolute voice of protest heard was that of the Communist Party. Then the Party took an anti-war and anti-British stand and advocated a policy of peace with Hitler. When the British Government began to curtail the freedom in India's political life by means of ordinances and the Defence of India Act, the Communist Party of India came forward with a programme, which involved large-scale submission to the government repression. Smashing of the obstacles laid by the government on the path of an uncompromising struggle for the attainment of full independence was its war-cry. This was to be done by carrying out incessant propaganda against both the war and the pro-war attitude of the Congress. Apart from that, manifestoes bearing the imprint of the tactics of the struggle were to be distributed in large numbers. One such pamphlet said that an appeal to the nation, if it was to be a 'national call', should come from a body that was national in its composition. The AICC alone was considered to be such a body. The Communist Party felt that "the policy of issuing a national call by a section of the left and of waiting for such a call will be suicidal. It will be nothing but adventurism."[24] It believed in the national revolution and held no faith in Gandhian techniques. In fact, if the AICC failed to issue a national call, the Communist Party resolved to develop the national revolution by linking the "scattered guerilla mass actions on different fronts at different times."

The course of action to be followed towards such a revolution was streamlined in a circular addressed to the students by the Calcutta district committee of the CPI. The struggle for the restoration of civil liberties, struggle for the fulfilment of the demands of the students, workers and peasants, struggle for the release of political prisoners and the observance of the Independence Day—all these small struggles were to be linked and thus "transformed into a country-wide united struggle against the war."[25]

With the increased participation of the masses in such a national revolution, after the issuance of the national call, the Communist Party believed that the fight for swaraj would begin. The Communist Party assigned a considerable responsibility to the student community in this great mass struggle. During this national calamity, the district committee of the CPI gave a rousing call to the student community of Bengal to proceed without fear, to towns, villages or bustees, along the path of struggle paved by them. Anti-war committees with selected revolutionary students in schools and colleges were to be formed in order to enable the real struggle to become a mass movement. On the path of this national struggle, the Communist Party visualized the undivided support of the people and hoped for a change in the attitude of the National Congress.

The unhealthy trend of the Communist versus Congress fight, which had already shown its ugly head in the student movement on several occasions before, made a final show of strength, when the AISF held its sixth annual session at Nagpur on 25 December 1940. Gandhiji's individual satyagraha campaign, launched in October 1940, to fight the British, was the subject of dispute between the two groups.[26] Congressites favoured the limited, non-violent satyagraha movement of Gandhiji, but the Communists resented Gandhiji's leadership and were all out for a militant programme. Trouble followed the federation election in Bengal. When the Communists tried to capture the organization by putting up a number of candidates, it was strongly resented by a large number of Congressites.[27] Failure to reach a consensus thwarted unity, and the two sections met separately, one under the presidency of Prof. Hiren Mukerji, and the other under Madan Mohan Prasad. Dr K.M. Ashraf, while inaugurating the conference, described satyagraha as "a very poor protest against the imposition of belligerency on India."[28] Prasad, on the other hand, upheld satyagraha movement as "a very dignified protest." With the failure of all efforts at mediation, the delegates met again in two

conferences and passed resolutions relating to the attitude of students towards the world war and to various other demands.

Before the Nagpur split occurred, there came into existence several state students' organizations, under the aegis of the AISF. The Madras Presidency Students' Conference was an effort to consolidate the student movement of the south comprising the four southern linguistic provinces. This was inaugurated at Madras on 7 January 1939. N.G. Ranga, the president of the conference, emphasised the need for such an organization, "to give an effective direction to South Indian public life, to indicate the right policy to be pursued by the government in regard to education and to check the arbitrary exercise of power by the various universities in our area.[29] S.B. Baltiwala, opening the conference, advised the students to form an "underground and overground organization" to achieve Indian freedom. A number of resolutions were passed, offering support to Congress programmes, rejecting assistance to Britain in any future imperialistic war and expressing disapproval of the government attitude towards the student movement in the princely states of Hyderabad, Tranvancore and Mysore. The authorities of the Annamalai University had expelled six students without any proper enquiry for their alleged violations of university discipline. The students who went on strike, in sympathy with the expelled students, met with repressive measures. The student strike gained an epic proportion culminating in the closure of the university for 48 days.[31] The Madras Students' Conference appealed to the University authorities to establish a peaceful atmosphere by meeting the just demands of the students.[32] The Communists in the Madras Students' Conference aimed at bringing out a nation-wide student struggle for freedom. This they demanded in the second annual meeting of the Madras Students' Conference.[33]

The Madras Students' Organization, another student body, gathered strength through the many strikes it organized in educational institutions, when demands of students were not conceded. A wave of student unrest swept over the Madras presidency since the declaration of the imperialistic war. The beginning was made in the Madras Engineering College. At a general body meeting of the college, a proposition moved by the Principal saying that the students should contribute to the war fund, was turned down by the students. When Pandit Nehru was arrested, students all over India recorded their protest in mass strikes. The Madras Government retaliated with a communique. This gave rise to a number of protest strikes, processions and meetings, followed by

police searches in the hostel rooms of the students and suppression of their activities. A close observation of the student strike during this period will reveal how these incidents helped the students to build up a strong position in the face of unexpected strategies from the British Government. It is beyond doubt that the experience gained by the students in these protest strikes stood them in good stead later, when the Quit India movement began under the auspices of the Indian National Congress.

On 9 November 1940, the Government of Madras issued a press communique expressing their strong disapprobation of the conduct of students in absenting themselves from college classes and organizing demonstrations calculated to interrupt the functioning of the college. The press communique said that the absence was concerted. Generally, the initiative was taken by a minority of students by harassing others who wanted to study, leading to considerable agitation. The government considered that "the student is not a person, who is fit to decide when he shall attend or not attend the courses which are provided for his instruction. In particular they must reject any suggestion that a student should be at liberty to decide to absent himself in order that he may make a theatrical protest against some act or policy with which the college is in no way concerned."[34] In the operative part of the communique the government asked the authorities of colleges under both private and public management to supply them with a list of names of leading student participants and organisers of such demonstrations. The government would punish them by debarring them from appointments in government services and by expelling them, if they belonged to government colleges.[35] That part of the communique, which imposed on the principals the unpleasant task of submitting lists of names of student leaders, was vehemently attacked by V.S. Srinivasa Sastri and C. Rajagopalachari. In a statement on the government communique issued to the press, Sastri viewed that "the punishment could well be left to the discretion of the principals." He commented upon the punishment proposed by the communique as one "far in excess of the offence and harmful to the society."[36]

The task of preparing lists of leading offenders, for the information of the government, was not one to be imposed on the principals. To be just and accurate enough to furnish the basis of a drastic and life-long disability, the lists were to be thorough and counterchecked. V.S. Srinivasa Sastri said that the proposed penalty imposed on the students was like killing a fly with a spear.[37] It is very curious that the government,

which assumed that the students were but an immature lot to judge themselves, had inflicted on them life-long disability "for what by implication is nothing more than a youthful peccadillo."[38] The 'self-respectors', who went to jail in connection with the anti-Hindi agitation were not debarred from government services.[39] When they interfered with the studies of their fellow students and adopted obstructionist tactics, the government only winked at it. But rigorous punishments were meted out to the students who struck work on account of their excessive nationalism, and their leaders were arrested. This double-dealing of the government brought to the surface the fact that the government was backing up only those who had set up an anti-national attitude. The student demonstrations that followed the arrest of Nehru were taken up by the students who were not isolated by the events taking place around them. Their protests proved that they were not clumps of mud. In this respect the government order was a piece of addleheaded oddity. No wonder, the communique became a target of vehement criticism in the press and platform and the students took the cause to the streets and passed resolutions, condemning it.

Under the auspices of the Madras Students' Organization, a demonstration to be followed by a public meeting was organized in Madras on 16 November 1940 to protest against the government communique. They took out a procession,[40] and held a meeting at Marina beach with Latif Afghani of the Madras Christian College in the chair. Latif said that they had assembled there to tell the government that they were prepared to fight for the freedom of the country. He urged the students, as the educated section of the people, to fight for peace, freedom and progress, the pillars of civilization. Representatives of several colleges in the city spoke condemning the communique.

The communique referred to government jobs as if the government would remain for ever. The students declared that unemployment in India was acute and that it would be so as long as the British Government continued here. They also made it clear that they were not job-hunters but were freedom-hunters. R. Achuthan (Law College) pointed out that protests and demonstrations were not enough for them. He urged the students to close their ranks to fight against imperialism and harness their energy to carry on the literacy campaign, the constructive programme of the Madras Students' Organization, through which they could carry the message of freedom to the masses. Students, in general, believed in non-violence and Gandhian techniques. These sentiments were echoed in some of their speeches. To N.C.

Ram of Christian College, the very foundation of their action depended on non-violence. He meant that the students should fight their opponents without any bitterness and convert them by means of love, peace and non-violence. Narasimhan (Government School of Technology) felt that, so long as Gandhiji was in their midst, the people might adopt non-violent methods. But, if the government rejected their demand for freedom and removed Gandhiji from their midst, he hoped that his countrymen would adopt the ways tried by other countries to achieve their freedom. Ganesan (Presidency College) said that in the event of Rajaji and Vallabhbhai Patel being arrested, it was their duty to bring them out of the prison. Almost all speeches reverberated with a spirit of nationalism, and the attitude of students towards a national emergency was only a straw in the wind, which proved correct in the days of the Quit India movement.

The Madras Students' Organization held another meeting on 16 December 1940 at the Triplicane Beach with Sultan Muhammed (Madras Christian College) in the chair. The meeting protested against the arrest and detention of six students of theAnnamalai University on 13 December, on the ground that they were spreading Communism. Subsequent events had resulted in a brutal lathi-charge by the police, in which students were beaten as well as dragged along the ground. Thyagarajan (a Congress worker) in a spirited speech referred to a student lying in a critical condition, whose private parts had got swollen as a result of stamping with a booted leg.[41] He expressed doubts as to the relevance of non-violence in the face of such highhandedness, and urged violent retaliation if the government provoked them unjustly. The meeting also desired that the government should appoint an impartial non-official committee to go into the matters of the Annamalainagar lathi-charges. The role of K.V. Reddi, the Vice-Chancellor of the university, in the whole affair was condemned. Another resolution moved by S. Rajagopalan (Law College) condemned the action of Sir Maurice Gwyer, Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University, in withholding the degrees of two students there. Papworth, the Director of Public Instruction, observed at Anantapur that "the students were an unproductive commodity and were a liability rather than an asset to the Government and that the present system of education is not the right of young men, but a privillege conferred on them by the Government."[42] It was pointed out in the meeting that the unwarranted and uncalled for observation of Papworth was an insult to the student community. Hanumantha Rao (Law College) who urged Papworth to

withdraw his damaging remarks observed that the money spent for education in India was that of the Indian tax-payer and not that of the British treasury. R. Achuthan (Law College), in another resolution, condemned the disciplinary action taken against students by the Principal of Loyola College, Madras, for taking their legitimate part in the normal activities of students. He said that the Principal's action was an inroad into the privileges of the students in general and the MSO in particular, and exhorted the students to vindicate their rights leading to their freedom.[43]

The activities of the police who suspected communist activities in the Annamalai University sparked off disturbances there. In the evening of 21 November 1940, a police party[44] conducted a search for alleged communist literature in certain rooms of the students at the Annamalai University hostel.[45] Constables were posted before the rooms of about twenty students and the search was carried out under the DIR. The students protested against the search. The police party withdrew from the hostel without achieving their object, when the students demanded of them the warrant authorising the search. According to one version, some of the students found a number of persons in their premises, whose presence there could not be properly accounted for. Hence, they demanded that those persons should leave the premises at once.[46] Another version described that a melee had ensued when the students protested. Brickbats were thrown, in which two or three constables, the Assistant DSP, one village Munsif, and a retired excise official, suffered minor injuries. According to the official version, the police had to conduct the search without the full cooperation of the authorities. Delay in the process of getting the help of the university authorities gave time to the students to master the situation. In the hostile circumstances, the police had to withdraw, "in order to avoid any risk of a riot."[47] Government made careful enquiries and trapped into jail, on 13 December 1940, eight students[48] who were considered to be the leading members of the Communist "cell" in the university. A large number of students held demonstration to protest against the arrest, in front of the PWD Inspector's Bungalow, where the District Magistrate and the DSP had been camping. When the crowd became threatening, the police resorted to mild lathi-charge injuring 30 students out of the 400 present.[49] These incidents gave occasion to a number of meetings of students as well as of other bodies at Chidambaram.[50] As a mark of respect for the injured, and in protest against the arrest of student leaders, the Annamalai University students did

not take their noon-meals on 17 December 1940. A students' meeting was held that day when resolutions protesting against the lathi- charge were passed. It also demanded a public inquiry into the matter.[51] At the request of the university authorities, the Circle Inspector of Tirukoilur withdrew his son K. Sivarama Krishnan for delivering a violent speech at the above-mentioned meeting.[52] The authorities said that '. . . all talk of students' strike vanished when the Vice-Chancellor threatened to report the ring-leaders to the government in accordance with the recent G.O. and to take disciplinary action against the others."[53] They also claimed that the students had begun to realise that defiance of authority would be heavily dealt with. Improvement in the situation, if there was any, was only shortlived. Examinations which had been postponed after the previous lathi-charge were held on 6th and 7th. But at the close of the examination, they went out in a procession, crying, "Down with War Funds", "Down with British Raj", and "Up with the Congress."[54] They carried with them the portrait of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

Protest against the lathi-charge was taken up by the AISF, and they decided to observe hartal leading to the closure of all educational institutions in the country. The arrival of Sultan Muhammad at Annamalainagar on 8 January was in this connection. He was a student of Madras as well as a member of the working committee of the AISF. Permission was not granted to him to address the students within the precincts of the university. However, on 9 January, Sultan Muhammad managed to address a gathering of about 200 students just outside the university premises.[55] He urged them to observe 'Annamalai Day' on 15 January. A few students, he told, would be given instructions as to the manner in which these demonstrations were to be reorganized. Latif Afghani of Madras and Muhammad Ghazhi of Nagpur, both members of the Students' Federation, were expected to participate in the demonstrations. This added force to the determination of the students to proceed with the 'Annamalai Day' celebrations in spite of the threats from the authorities. Smelling breach of peace in the university, the Sub-divisional Magistrate issued orders prohibiting certain agitators from outside, from entering Chidambaram on this occasion."[56] Students, whose names were found in the list furnished to the District Magistrate by the university authorities in strict confidence, were warned, and a small body of Reserve Police was also despatched in advance to Chidambaram.[57] Latif Afghani and some other students were detained at Madras. Pongal holidays found many of the students

in their homes where they stayed a few days more. This averted their presence at Annamalainagar on the 15 January. Police measures coupled with the intervention of the Pongal holidays foiled all attempts to celebrate 'Annamalai Day.' Later when the university affairs settled down, the government directed the release on parole of those students who had been detained a few weeks before. The order laid down the condition that they should "enter into a bond, with their parents or guardians as sureties, not to take part in any communistic activities in future."[58] They were confined to the towns or villages where their parents or guardians had been residing.

The credit for keeping alive the political fervour among students in Malabar area goes to C.M. Yagnamurthy Namboodiripad of the Government Victoria College, Palghat. At first he was the General Secretary of the Palghat Students' Union. Later he became the General Secretary of the All-Kerala Students' Union. Meetings, processions and other demonstrations were organized by him. The conference which he helped to organise with Dr K.B. Krishna in the chair was noteworthy. On 26 November 1940, the Palghat Students' Union took out a procession ending in a meeting which passed resolutions condemning the government communique and the arrest of the Congress leaders. The Victoria College, though not connected with the Palghat Students' Union, was represented by some 40 students. Under the leadership of Yagnamurthy Namboodiripad, P.R. Venkatachalam and K. Ramachandra Rao, students of the Government Victoria College, Palghat, held a procession and a meeting on 26 January 1941. Yagnamurthy Namboodiripad moved a resolution appealing to the students "to stand by the country in this hour of trial." The Palghat Taluk Students' Conference was held at Kollengode on 16 February 1941 with Yagnamurthy Namboodiripad in the chair. In the course of his speech he criticised the individual satyagraha movement and its organizers like Gandhiji and others. He extended his activities also to other parts of the Palghat district, and to places outside. He presided over the meeting of students at Calicut, which resolved to conduct study classes for labourers, on general Communist lines. He was in close contact with the staunch Communists of the time like P. Balachandra Menon, Narayanan Kutty and Imbichi Bava. He failed in the B.Sc. examination of March 1941, and was denied re-admission to the college. On 28 June, he was arrested in his room under the DIR and was taken to the police station.[59] The Federation Office on the College Road was searched and certain papers were seized.

In protest against the arrest of Akbari (a student of the Guindy Engineering College), Latif, Achuthan and Ganesan (also students), the students of the college went on strike on 21 and 22 January. The principal came out with a mass-fine order and the scholarship-holders who were absent on the strike days were required to give it in writing that they would not take part in such demonstrations during the rest of their college course.[60] On 3 February a deputation of students presented to the principal a *Mahazar* petition, signed by 456 students, requesting him to cancel the order imposing fines. Students also protested against the principal's demand for an undertaking from scholarship-holders. 9 February was fixed as the last day for the principal to reply. Since they received no reply from the principal on that day the students abstained from the classes the next day.[61] On the promise of the principal that their request might be considered favourably, the students stopped demonstrations and started attending classes in the afternoon. That evening the principal sent cyclostyled letters to the parents asking them to keep their sons under restraint. Under the instructions of the DPI, the principal imposed fines on students who absented themselves without leave.[62] Citing the Government press communique of 9 November 1940, the DPI called upon the principal to submit urgently a list of prominent student leaders. The principal submitted a list of 11 students who were members of the MSO. He took a harder line with the students. In regard to the action to be taken against these students, the principal said: "Students whose names have been submitted as leaders may be suspended for one year. They may be dismissed from the college with a promise to reinstate them at government's discretion if they apologise and give an assurance of future good conduct."[63] The MSO held a public meeting on 22 January 1941, at the Triplicane beach with Aga Sahi (Presidency College) in the chair, to protest against the arrest and detention. A student from the Christian College said that the "British imperialism was out to crush their unity and they would answer them with a unity and determination the like of which India never witnessed before. Students would solve the political problems facing the country which the old and senile leaders were unable to solve."[64] Another speaker from the same college said that, with the arrest of their four comrades, the notoriety of the British Government had reached the climax. He declared that they could not sit quiet any longer and that "the time had come for them to go forward and try with all their might to secure the release of their comrades."[65] A student of the Stanley Medical College

said that thousands of Achuthans and Latifs would come forward and replace the reactionary government that sat in Fort St. George. Action, and not words, was wanted to deal with the government. They were prepared to go to jail and face any sort of repression. In that event, even thousands of jails would be of no use before their sacrifices. On 15 February seven students[66] were expelled from the college for allegedly 'objectionable' activities. They were all students of the Engineering College, whose names were submitted by the principal for punishment for taking some leading part in "the distribution of Independence flags, advising people to stay away, garlanding, etc., and being prominent strikers who hold strong views." The principal of the college justified his action of forbidding the students to hold meetings and indulge in similar activities, by citing the said government communique and by the Madras Educational Rules as well as the College Rules.[67] The expulsion of these students was condemned in another meeting organized by the MSO on 15 February at Tilak Ghat. A resolution, demanding the withdrawal of the expulsion order and urging the students to continue their fight unitedly and calling on the public to join and support them, was passed. The resolution stated that "the hammer of imperialistic repression had dealt yet another ruthless blow on the student community, this time coming in the shape of mass expulsion," of 8 students. "They firmly believed that the expulsions were unjust, undemocratic and fascist in character. They believed that any student of any free country would have done the same thing like them."[68]

The principal sent circulars to the parents of the noted demonstrators, pointing out the gravity of the situation. They were readily responded to by parents with replies and by students with apologies. This gave the principal an impression that good conduct for the future would be assured if the government would pardon the 'offenders' who apologised.[69] But the attitude of the government was uncompromising. The government had decided not to grant mercy to the students under orders of expulsion, unless the DPI was satisfied that the previous recommendation had been based on false or incorrect information regarding the activities of these students.[70] The previous suggestion of the government was that, if they were satisfied with the guarantees for good behaviour of the students, they might be re-admitted.[71] But, the government reconsidered the issue and refrained from promising them readmission.[72]

Tables were turned with the change in national as well as international politics. On 23 June, Hitler's army dishonoured the Russo-

German non-aggression pact by invading Soviet Russia. This was a turning-point in the war situation in Europe, necessitating a realignment of forces. Russia moved its army against the Nazi-Fascist forces and became a member of the allied forces by signing a non-aggression pact with Great Britain. With this, Stalin exhorted all honest people to support the allied war effort, and the Soviet war-cry against British imperialism disappeared all at once. The CPI, too, staged a reversal of roles. This confused the national scene.

With the fall of Pearl Harbour to Japan, America, which had so far followed a policy of non-intervention, was forced to become a party in the war. The unhindered march of the Japanese army brought down in quick succession, the American, British and Dutch colonies in South-East Asia. Soon, the rising power of Japan began to show its presence in the Indian waters. When subjected to Japanese bombing, early in 1942, it was the British administration that took the first flight for safety.[75] This showed the folly of depending upon the British at a time of emergency. Besides this, the war-torn economy on the one hand, and the spread of cholera and poverty on the other, inflicted untold misery on the Indian masses. The confidence of the people in the British Government began to wane, and the people began to think in terms of setting up a National Government. In order to capture Indian co-operation in the British war effort, and to win over the confidence of the Indian people, the British Government sent Sir Stafford Cripps to India for negotiations. But, the failure of the Cripps mission, much against Indian aspirations, was decisive. Gandhiji, who called the Cripps proposals 'a post-dated cheque,' refused to accept them. Finally, the AICC came out with the "national call," for the declaration of which the CPI had been forcing the Congress for a long period.

The AISF held its annual conference at Patna on 31 December 1941. The Patna stand of the students, as expected by M. Faruqui and K.M. Ahmed, General Secretaries of AISF, was to "marshall all youths and students to checkmate the Fascist greed for more power."[74] The Conference declared unconditional support to the war efforts. A long statement of policy on the war, adopted by an overwhelming majority, marked the spirit of the day. The statement read that the war was a people's war against the forces of fascism and was no longer an imperialistic war. It further said, "It is not enough to express moral sympathy for the victims to this war, but we must unite and declare that we are determined to do every thing to win it,"[75] adding that "the national struggle for independence would be suspended. It is through

war mobilisation and not individual or mass satyagraha that resolute strides on the road to independence would be taken."[76] This pro-war statement was passed at the second day's sitting of the AISF (Faruqui group) held under the presidentship of Mian Iftikharuddin, the President of the Punjab Provincial Congress Committee, who later joined the Muslim League. Dr H. Zahir, in his inaugural address, deplored the factious tendency of a section of students after the Nagpur session. The line that he recommended to the students was the one that Pandit Nehru had advocated on this subject. It is evident from this, and from other information, that all members of the AISF were not in favour of unconditional support to the war. A prominent section, preaching allegiance to the Congress programme was against the policy of having any truck with the government in its imperialist war. The leaders of the Communist group in the AISF were members of the CPI, and naturally the policy adopted by the CPI was accepted by its student wing. Particularly when the Patna session of the AISF promised to support the anti-fascist people's war which was being waged commonly by the Allied powers, the government was called upon to declare its attitude towards the AISF. To a question in the Legislative Assembly by Maulvi Syed Murtaza Sahib Bahadur regarding this, Sir Reginald Maxwell, not only welcomed the "genuine assistance in the formation of a national and anti-Fascist War Front," but also declared that their attitude towards the AISF would be presumably identical to that of their attitude to the Communist Party's change of heart.[77] In the words of the Additional Secretary, "the Communist section is very careful to disguise its allegiance to the CPI, and only a minority of its leading lights can be definitely identified as members of the CPI. However, there is no denying that its policy, as dictated by the CPI, will develop on the same lines. The same attitude can, therefore, be adopted towards the AISF as to the CPI."[78]

When the house of the AISF was divided over the question of war policy the government decided, "the crux of the matter is to divide the sheep (if any) from the goats, and then to make use of the former in such a way as not only to exploit the fissiparous tendencies that have already appeared, but also to make positive use of their services. This would mean that each case would have to be examined and dealt with on its merit . . ."[79] Thus, the government decided to seize the opportunity to "convert a rebel into a useful citizen," whose energies and enthusiasm might possibly be directed "into more patriotic channels."

The Government of India which felt that it could channel the student

energy to galvanise the anti-fascist movement among students, instructed the provincial governments to take measures to release the student detenus of the AISF. The Home Department instructed the General Secretary of the AISF to direct the Provincial Students' Federation to assist the Provincial Government in this respect. C. Kannali Ram, General Secretary of the Tamil Nadu Provincial Students' Federation, in his letter to the Chief Secretary of Madras, furnishing him the required list, requested the government to pass orders to free all students convicted, detained, interned and expelled, from restrictions and allow them to continue their studies.[80] He urged their early release to enable them to attend the ensuing student conferences and war conferences at Delhi on 15, 16, 17 May 1942. The Student Federation was of the view that the students, if released, would add to the strength of the defence of the country.

Ever since the Patna Resolution, the Communist majority in the AISF began to dwindle, owing either to the unpopularity of pro-war policy or to the ascendancy of the Congress Socialist Party section within the AISF. This drift was very much revealed in the letter sent by the Secretary of the UP Branch of the AISF to his counterpart at Delhi. He lamented that they had failed to convince the rank and file, and had "run much ahead of the general mass of students," losing, as a result, considerable following, and bringing about an isolation from them. The pro-war policy of the Communists was bitterly criticised by the Indian National Congress, and its leaders like Nehru, Azad, Paliwal and Kidwai moved from district to district, condemning the same. About the impact of Nehru's speech, the letter said: "In five minutes he can destroy.what we built in weeks or even months. Cawnpore Students' Union of which you have heard so much is now reeling under the blows dealt out by Nehru and his lieutenants."[81] The letter also referred to the resolution of the Uttar Pradesh Congress Committee to organise a Congress Students' Federation to check the organised disruption of the Communist students.

This period witnessed the growth of the student movement with a political colour. The student movement came of age when they met in an all-India conference to form the AISF. This marked the pinnacle of its prestige. The power of the student community was much sought after. Politicians gave them training in physical culture and taught them the essentials of the respective political knowledge. But some of the national as well as international developments of the day threatened the growth and solidarity of the student movement. The formation of

an All-India Muslim Students' Federation to work for the creation of Pakistan was one among them. The 'People's War' theory developed by the CPI, in order to help the Russian involvement in the Second World War, was the other. These critical questions were decisive in shaping the destiny of the nation. When the political leaders disputed over these questions and directed the national movement according to their ways and ideas, the student community emerged with a political personality of their own. They had gained much experience in many agitations led against government oppression. On several occasions, a section of students found the futility of Gandhian methods of agitation. The youth always opted for revolution. They never liked to remain idle with their hands tied when the national leaders were imprisoned. Many of their speeches echoed that they expected a spontaneous revolution, in the event of the imprisonment of the national leaders. When the momentous occasion arose with the AICC decision to launch the Quit India movement, the students made the real plunge.

Notes and References

1. AICC File No. G.8/1931, pp. 147-150, NMML; S. Gopal (Ed.), *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, Vol. V, pp. 222-223.
2. *The Leader*, 13 September 1931.
3. Jawaharlal Nehru, Circular to all Provincial Seva Dals and Members-in-Charge, Hardikar papers, NMML; S. Gopal, *op. cit.*, p. 239.
4. N.G. Ranga, *Fight for Freedom* (Autobiography), p. 204.
5. *Fortnightly Reports, 10 June 1938.*
6. *Ibid.*, 24 June 1938.
7. *Ibid.*, 19 May 1939.
8. N.G. Ranga, *op. cit.*
9. *Ibid.*, p. 207.
10. A.B. Shinde, *Political Consciousness among College Students*, p. 155.
11. Mitra (Ed.), *The Indian Annual Register*, 1934, Vol. I, p. 298.
12. Prabodh Chandra, *Student Movement in India*, pp. 54-55.
13. M. Muni Reddi, *The Student Movement in India*, pp. 143-144; A.B. Shinde, *op.cit.*, p. 156; Myron Weiner, *The Politics of Scarcity*, p. 176.
14. Mitra, *op. cit.*, 1937, Vol. I, p. 416.
15. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 405-66.
16. *Ibid.*, 1938, Vol. II, p. 439.
17. *Ibid.*, 1983, Vol. I, pp. 412-413.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 414.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Fortnightly Reports*, 20 January 1938.
21. Mitra, *op. cit.*, 1939, Vol. I, p. 463.
22. *Ibid.*, 1940, Vol. I, p. 423.
23. Gandhi's speech at Bombay AICC, 16 September 1940; Mitra, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 214-216.
24. *Communist Party's call to Students*, issued by the Calcutta District Committee, Communist Party of India, Home, Pol., 37/27/1940, NAI.
25. *Ibid.*
26. Gene D. Overstreet and Marshal Windmiller, *Communism in India*, p. 397; B.B. Misra, *The Indian Political Parties*, pp. 465-466.
27. Mitra, *op. cit.*, 1940, Vol. II., p. 414.
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Ibid.*, 1939, Vol. I, p. 47.
30. *Fortnightly Reports*, 19 January 1939.
31. P.M. Joshi, *Student Revolts in India*, pp. 42-46.
32. Mitra, *op. cit.*, p. 473.
33. *The Hindu*, 4 November 1941.
34. G.O. No. 629, Education, 24 April 1941, TNA.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Indian Express*, 11 November 1940.
37. *The Hindu*, 12 November 1940.
38. *Ibid.*
39. *Dinamani*, 12 November 1940.
40. The processionists carried with them placards and banners bearing the following slogans:
    Down with exploiters, withdraw the Government communique, we demand free India, we demand freedom of assembly, Hands off China, Release Nehru, Down with repression, Release all the arrested students, Fight for freedom, Long live Soviet Union – the land of liberty, Democratise educational system, Down with authoritarianism, Freedom first, Help Gandhi in his fight, Long live united students' fight, Stand united and fight for freedom, peace, progress, Long live revolution, Long live students front, we want freedom. An effigy was carried at the head of the procession and it had on it placards relating to the following: Imperialism, Communalism, Illiteracy, Defence of India Act, Repression. (G.O. No. 2393, Pub. (General) Department Misc. Series, Confidential, 4 December 1940, p. 10, TNA).
41. Free translation of extracts of a Tamil speech delivered by Thyagarajan at a public meeting organised by the MSO on 16 December 1940 at Triplicane beach, *Ibid.*, p. 45.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 42.

44. The police party included the Assistant DSP Mr Trustocott, accompanied by Circle and Sub-Inspectors and a posse of about 25 constables.
45. *Indian Express*, 23 November 1940.
46. *Ibid.*
47. *Fortnightly Reports*, 2 December 1940.
48. This included K. Diraviyam aged 15 years who was restricted to his father's house in Madras city.
49. *Fortnightly Reports*, 20 December 1940.
50. *Ibid.*, 4 January 1940.
51. G.O. No. 629, Education, 24 April 1941, TNA.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 86.
55. *Fortnightly Reports*, 21 January 1941.
56. *Ibid.*
57. G.O. No. 629, Education, 24 April 1941, TNA.
58. *Fortnightly Reports*, 3 January 1941.
59. *The Hindu*, 29 June 1941.
60. *Ibid.*, 10 February 1941.
61. *Indian Express*, 11 February 1941.
62. Letter from the DPI, Madras, 3 February 1941, to the Secretary to the Government, Education and PH. Department, G.O. No. 693. Education and PH. Department, Misc., Series, 5 May 1941, TNA.
63. *Ibid.*, 10 February 1941.
64. *The Hindu*, 23 January 1941.
65. *Ibid.*
66. They were D. Mahapatra, N.S. Sastri, Mohandas, M. Ramachandran, K. Ramakrishna Chaudhary, M. Antony and C. Pulla Reddi.
67. *Indian Express*, 16 February 1941.
68. *Ibid.*, 18 February 1941.
69. Letter from the Principal, Engineering College, Guindy to the Secretary to Government, Education and Public Health Department, Fort St. George, dated 12 February 1941, G.O. No. 693. Education and PH. Department Misc., Series (Confidential), 5 May 1941, TNA.
70. Letter from the DPI to the Secretary to the Government, *Ibid.*
71. *Ibid.*
72. *Ibid.*
73. Govind Sahai, *42 Rebellion*, p. 317.
74. *Amrit Bazar Patrika*, 3 January 1942.
75. *Ibid.*

76. *Ibid.*
77. Home, Pol., (Internal) Secret, 22/12/1942, NAI.
78. Additional Secretary's Note, 19 March 1942; *Ibid.*
79. Memorandum, *Ibid.*
80. Letter from Kannali Ram to the Chief Secretary, Madras, 29 April 1942, Government of Madras, G.O. No. 3236, 9 October 1942, Public, General Department, 1942, TNA.
81. *Daily Digest*, 16 March 1942.

Chapter 8

Quit India Movement

THE Quit India movement was not a pre-planned campaign; it was a spontaneous uprising. Naturally, neither the Congress nor the Government were aware of the heights the movement might reach. The Congress leaders thought that they could sort out the problems at the negotiation table. The government believed that the Congress would not venture to launch an agitation at the time of an emergency. But at the eleventh hour, the government precipitated it by sending behind the bars, all the Congress leaders and banning the Congress organization itself. By this step the government thought to nip the movement in the bud in time by leaving it leaderless. Naturally, this brought to the forefront the elements which formed the second line of leadership, i.e., the students, peasants and middle class. The students assumed the leadership, and the peasantry remained the fighting force.[1]

The student community had gained much political knowledge from the several strikes held in the campus in the previous years. In many speeches they delivered on those occasions, they foresaw the arrest of the leaders and, in such an eventuality, decided to break out in rebellion. The Communists and the Congress Socialists had trained the students in many of their study classes and this stood the students in good stead when the real revolution was forced upon them. In the three months preceding the August rebellion, Gandhiji had said that he would suggest some kind of non-cooperation and a one-day cessation of all work in the country in the event of breakdown of the negotiations.[2] He had exhorted the students to get ready for a final fight until the attainment of freedom. Thus, Gandhiji, by asking the students to get ready for a final fight, provided the necessary psychological inspiration to the student community. After the Congress president had declared the Quit India resolution[3] passed, Mahatma Gandhi addressed the Congress Working Committee for 140 minutes. His call to the students in this context was memorable. He told them that he would not invite them to join the struggle, if it was only to go back to their studies after some time. For a short while, till he could frame a programme for the struggle, he asked the students to say to their professors: "We belong

to the Congress. Do you belong to the Congress or to the Government? If you belong to the Congress, you need not vacate your posts. You will remain at your posts but teach us and lead us unto freedom . In all fights for freedom, the world over, students have made significant contributions. If in the interval that is left to us before the actual fight begins, you do even the little I have suggested to you, you will have changed the atmosphere and will have prepared the ground for the next step."[4]

'The draft instructions for the guidance of civil resisters' was prepared by Mahatma Gandhi on 7 August 1942 and was discussed by the CWC on the next day. Owing to the unexpected arrest of the leaders and their removal to the gaols, this document failed to see the light of day. It was left to the Navajivan Publishing House of Ahmedabad to release this secret document in their second edition of *Gandhiji's Correspondence with the Government, 1942-44*. This secret and confidential document penned by Gandhiji himself had close resemblance with the 12-point programme, which was in wide circulation after the internment of Gandhiji, on the following points. It exhorted (*a*) public to stage an all-India hartal, (*b*) all freedom loving people to join the struggle, (*c*) all students to leave government-controlled educational institutions, and (*d*) the people to break the salt laws and refuse to pay the land taxes. Gandhiji's draft plan for an open rebellion required that "all students reading in institutions conducted or controlled by the Government should come out of these institutions. Those who are above sixteen years of age should join the satyagraha. Those who so leave these institutions should do so with a clear understanding that they are not to return to them until independence is achieved. There should be no coercion whatsoever in this matter. Only those who of their own free will wish to do so should come out. No good can come out of coercion."[6] Gandhiji never wanted any Indian to adopt violence to free India. Instead, he preached non-violent suffering as the only way. The sabotage was the result of the arrest of Gandhiji and his men, which left the movement rudderless.

In the same vein, Gandhiji's rousing call to students was reiterated in thousands of leaflets distributed throughout in the country, counselling students above sixteen years of age to leave educational institutions and conduct the non-violent struggle to its victorious culmination. In the emergency that had dawned upon the country, when the Congress leaders were put behind the bars, the students were declared to be the proper persons to supply the gap. They were never to be passive spectators of the national revolution that was going on around them

They were urged to rise to the occasion and prove worthy of the great call that had been made to them.[7] They were to be in the vanguard of the struggle and the task of awakening and vitalising the dumb millions of the nation was made the solemn and sacred duty of the students.[8]

Students and Professors should, the last message of Mahatma Gandhi said, "imbibe the spirit of freedom. They should stand by the Congress. They must have the courage to say that they are for the Congress. Should the emergency arise, they should cheerfully abandon their occupation and careers."[9]

A Tamil book entitled *Gandhi Malar Manavarukku*, which was banned by the Madras Government, had exerted great influence upon the students. This was a Tamil rendering by V. Ramaswami and A.L. Natarajan, of an English compilation by Sri Anand T. Hingorani, of Gandhiji's *Young India* and *Harijan*. The book contained Gandhiji's views on students and strikes, non-cooperation, satyagraha, boycott, etc. Gandhiji was vehement in attacking English as the medium of instruction. Gandhiji said that warriors like Pratap Singh were born during Akbar's regime. Patriots like Sivaji flourished during the reign of Aurangzeb. Some sort of freedom was found in the Mughal period. But the Indians turned slaves under the English system of education. The nation became effeminate, and lost its manliness. Gandhiji observed: "History will count the blighting imposition of English as the medium of instruction as one of the greatest evils of foreign rule." He considered that "it has sapped the energy of the nation, it has shortened the lives of the pupils, it has estranged them from the masses, it has made education unnecessarily expensive. If this process is still persisted in, it will rob the nation of its soul."[10] Gandhiji said that he had dedicated his life to the destruction of the system of education which he considered to be satanic,[11] and exhorted the Indian intellectuals to free themselves from this hypnotic spell of English medium.

Students bravely responded to the call of the nation and proved their patriotism. Leaving the government schools and colleges was considered to be the safest and most honourable course open to the students according to Gandhiji. He continued: "The students will be thrown out whenever a conflict occurs between the government and the people. They should be ready even for this. This is the next best course for them to follow. In many places the students themselves were leaders in the revolt against the government. If they cannot become so, they must at least become staunch and true followers of the leaders. Let their facing of the consequences be as brave as was their response

to the nation's call. Let them not humiliate themselves. Let them not surrender their self-respect in trying to re-enter colleges and schools from which they may have been dismissed."[12]

The nationalist faction of the All-India Students' Federation identified the aim of the bureaucrats to be the ultimate destruction of the national movement, by weakening its fighting force and by building up an anti-Congress and anti-national front. In a statement to the press, Miss Perin Bharucha, General Secretary of the AISF, called upon the students all over the country to protest against the arrest of the national leaders and demanded the government to release them.[13] An AISF circular stated that, after trapping the leaders of the national struggle into a 'deadly bog', the imperialist powers were after the students by forcing them "to descend from political demonstration to futile rioting." Foiling this imperialist scheme was considered to be the sacred duty of the AISF. This was to be achieved by shielding the students from falling a prey to police terror, through a non-violent path, keeping away from incendiarism and hooliganism, thus preserving the political discipline of the student movement.[14] The circular then declared to the students "not to get provoked, to keep our hands with courage and coolness, not to allow our fellow-students to get provoked, to shield them from all provocation and so foil the monstrous game to destroy our national movement, this and nothing else is our duty, our policy."[15]

Once the task of the AISF was identified with 'patriotic heroism', then, the forms of action to be adopted emerged out of these principles. Another circular favoured 'disciplined, well-guarded and organized demonstrations' ending up in a 'disciplined, well-guarded, protest meeting'. In case it was banned, the students were to disperse peacefully and were not to defy the ban order. On such occasions, students could hold meetings inside or at the gates of educational institutions or hostels, or in the homes of popular students. This was to give the student movement "a fighting lead for non-stop, peaceful and disciplined political demonstrations against repression and for immediate release."[16] At times, when lock-outs were declared and the educational institutions were closed, the students were required to "come out vigorously with the demand 'no closing down' of the institutions."

When such lock-outs emptied the educational institutions and hostels, and the students got demoralised in their homes, an energetic and resourceful lead from the Students' Federation was expected. In order to establish contact with students who did not come to the college gates any more, student workers were required to patrol the streets and get

such students as they came across, to the Students' Federation office. Students were then asked to conduct formal study circles and informal discussions. Soon after getting the slogans they were required to come to the "morning gate meetings to demand the re-opening of the institutions and to demonstrate against the closing down of colleges and schools."[17] The students should cut out of the political black-out by holding mass meetings and thus rejuvenate their political life. After shielding the fellow-students from the police provocation and leading them "with the spirit unbroken, out of the bog of anarchy and demoralisation," they should work out the August slogan and their National Defence Conference resolutions.

After the Bombay session of the AICC on 8 August 1942, Gandhiji was waiting to unfold his strategy. But the unexpected happened. When the revolutionary programme was just to be launched, the British Government jailed Gandhiji, the organiser and master of the movement. As an attempt to break the backbone of the Indian National Congress, all other Congress workers, throughout the length and breadth of the country, were arrested and removed to jails. The news of the arrest of Mahatma Gandhi and the popular leaders of the nation spread like wild fire. The soul of the nation was excited. A wave of non-violent protests spread over the whole of India. But the government began to unleash the forces of oppression. That was from 11 August 1942. Incarceration of the national leaders, and the repression of the non-violent protest, gave the movment a violent turn, thus marking the beginning of the second War of Independence.

This was also the first full scale demonstration of the power of the student strike in India.[18] For the student community took the stewardship of the high ship of the Indian national movement, which was left stewardless in the seas of internationl politics by the British. In their attempt to balance and steer ahead the ship, amidst the tidal waves that stormed the waters, the students had, at times, to abandon the non-violent programmes enunciated by their elders. But all their efforts, put together, saved the nation from a dilemma and calamity at a critical period.

Students of the Madras Presidency protested against the arrest of the Congress leaders by a spontaneous strike which virtually emptied almost all the educational institutions.[19] They took out big processions and the streets reverberated with the slogan of the Quit India movement. At the meetings they held at the end of the processions, speeches were made which echoed the grief that struck the nation in those days.

They passed protest resolutions condemning the policy of the government, and August 9 and 10 passed without any untoward happenings. Beyond congregating and shouting slogans, the students did nothing in particular. Police repression in Bombay, Delhi, Calcutta and elsewhere, derailed the Gandhian spirit of the non-violence and the infuriated students began to strike back at the repressive machinery, in a way unheard of before. Arrests, prosecutions, internments, lathicharges, whipping, firing and brutal manhandling were let loose by the repressive machinery of the government. This was retaliated by the student community, by executing a hammering blow with the help of stones, brickbats, fire and even countrymade bombs. In the outburst of excitement, non-violence slipped out of their hands. But the students of the Madras Presidency adopted only minimum violence, leaving aside a few incidents which took them to the brink of violence.

Police repression and firing in various places in north India, and on 11 August 1942 at Madurai in the south, in which several died and were injured, marked the beginning of a chain reaction on the part of the students. For their political involvement, policemen awarded them punishments with canes, lathis and firearms. Educational authorities took disciplinary actions such as imposition of fines, issue of transfer certificates, suspension and dismissal. Law-courts inflicted penalties ranging from fining and whipping to simple or rigorous imprisonment. The students were punished for various offences e.g., preventing or persuading the students from entering the college or schools by closing the gate or by lying across the gates; causing obstruction to traffic by picketing; addressing gatherings of students in the court premises or other public places in contravention of the orders of the Commissioner of Police; staging processions and demonstrations and shouting slogans in public thoroughfares; sending letters to lawyers, police and other government officials; dissuading them from rendering any aid to war effort and to abstain from practice and the discharge of their duties; inducing government servants to resign; picketing of courts, secretariats and other public institutions; affixing 'prejudicial' or 'objectionable' manuscript wall posters in government offices and other public places; distributing or possessing prejudicial literature; setting fire to the school buildings, libraries and post-boxes; cutting telegraph and telephone lines; stopping trains by pulling alarm chains; throwing stones at the trains; travelling in trains without tickets; flying national or students' flags at the college or hostel buildings; raising 'prejudicial' slogans such as 'Release national leaders', 'Concede na-

tional demand', 'Government servants resign,' 'Down with British Imperialism,' 'Quit India', 'Do or Die', etc.

The government interned the prominent Congress leaders in the city and the suburbs, in order to arrest the movement from its very start. In Madras city, the presence of a large number of troops and the police precautions averted the manifestation of a violent outburst.[20] So, the main centre of activity was "almost completely confined to educational institutions."[21] During the month of August students were not guilty of any violence.[22] But even before the expiry of that month, violence erupted in many places. This phase of the revolution was marked by attacks on governmental property leading to their destruction by mobs or small groups or by individuals. In Guntur, a mob of students and the 'rowdies', as the English put it, threw stones at the police and the passing carts and continued it even after the Divisional Magistrate and the police asked them to disperse. Repeated lathi-charges failed to disperse the mob and the police were finally forced to open fire, as a result of which two were killed and six injured.[23] This was on 14 August. On 31 August, they set fire to the building of the Deputy Collector's office at Erode. The police extinguished the fire. Subsequently the police arrested a student of the London Mission Community Training School and seized inflammable articles and 'prejudicial' literature from his house. A thatched shed of the Board High School in Vizagapatam, a local Municipal High School at Pollachi[24] and the Board Elementary School in a village in Madura were also burnt down. The burning of the Municipal School building at Hospet by students was estimated to have caused a damage worth Rs 1,43,000.[25] A Moplah school at Malappuram was set on fire on 11 September 1942. On the night of 30 September, a futile attempt was made to set fire to the library of the Andhra University at Guntur. Those students whose names were struck off the rolls for not returning to their classes after the expiry of the time limit prescribed by the authorities, were suspected to be the 'culprits'.[26] In Madura, students threw acid bulbs at a police inspector, who was controlling an unruly crowd.

Attempts to set fire to the contents of the post boxes were reported from Nellore, Ramnad, Vizagapatam, Madras, Guntur and Trichinopoly districts. Guntur witnessed three such instances, all on 24 December.[27] A number of similar incidents were reported, all from Guntur, since then. These were done, by dropping either envelopes or test-tubes containing combustibles like yellow phosphorus. Local students were suspected to be behind this, and a few arrests were made

in this connection.

In the matter of causing sabotage, Guntur broke all records in the Madras Presidency.[28] From there, in the month of February 1943, four instances of destruction of the PWD telephone system were reported.[29] In the course of a search in the room of a student, who was caught in the act of wire cutting, a file containing correspondence with the Indian revolutionaries abroad, like Rash Behari Bose and others in Japan, during 1930 was seized. Guntur can be singled out as the storm centre of the movement in the south. Here, the school and college students spearheaded the movement. Congress extremists and other revolutionaries worked behind them, in their massive attacks on the railway and the communication system. Damage done to the railway stations of Tenali, Chirala, Bapatala, Nidubrole and Sangam Jagarlamudi, were some of the leading incidents. In order to disperse the threatening crowds that gathered at the railway station on 12 August 1942, the police had to resort to fire. This killed six and injured eleven, and the estimated damage caused to the railway property was worth Rs 2,50,000.[30] The damage caused to the railway station at Chirala by a mob of 1,500, largely of students, was estimated to be Rs 1,00,000.[31] Similarly, the railway station at Nidubrole was set fire to by a mob of about 500 students, causing damage worth Rs 30,000.[32] In Guntur, the outbreak on 13 August assumed an alarming proportion. A riotous mob of 2,000, consisting largely of students had gathered opposite the Hindu College. Traffic was disrupted and the police opened fire to disperse the mob. The casualties were: two killed, and twelve injured.[33] The students of the Annamalai University held a meeting on 9 August and passed a resolution which condemned the arrest of Congress leaders. Persuasion by the professors stopped the students from demonstrating. However, on 15 August, posters exhorting the students not to fall behind the rest of the presidency in organizing demonstrations against the action of the government, appeared on the walls of the university. The "Annamalai University Organization" was formed to promote the aforesaid objects.[34] A notice issued by the Annamalai University Vice-Chancellor warned the absenting students with removal of their names from the rolls. This was taken up by the students who abstained from the classes saying that all the names might be removed from the rolls. The uncompromising attitude of the students, as well as their attempt to prolong the strike, forced the authorities to close the university for forty days.

The despatch abstract papers relating to the August disturbances in

colleges and schools in Madras city and the mofussil areas sent to T. Austin, the Adviser to Governor, by Statham, the DPI, serve as an informative document. The feelers that Statham set forth to assess the intensity of the political storm that ravaged the academic atmosphere, were either defective or bureaucratic. Statham, who had one eye on the presentees in the attendance registers of the educational institutions, and the other on the academic peace, reported from the very beginning that there were no "serious" troubles in the colleges and schools under his jurisdiction. On the whole, college students in particular, even where they abstained from classes, had been perfectly peaceful.[35] He was very optimistic about the outcome of the movement. At times he raised his brows on the paper reports, especially those which appeared in the *Hindu* and the *Indian Express*. These reports about students both in Madras and in the mofussil educational institutions were condemned as "nearly always inaccurate and misleading," and tending only to increase trouble. The DPI several times stressed the necessity of disbelieving such reports. He based his arguments on the protest made by several schools in Madras district against incorrect reporting. Sitting undisturbed by the storm of indignation that swept the entire educational institutions, he was rather calm firmly believing that the situation could be easily met with the help of circulars, threats of derecognition and denial of aids to schools.

Efforts through leaflets and by leaders were made to launch a general strike on 20 August in Palghat. The DPI noted with satisfaction that the general strike was a futile attempt.[36] Picketing in the St. Aloysius's College, Mangalore, reduced the attendance there on 19, 20 and 21 August. The DPI again noted with satisfaction that on the 20th, the Government Girls High School, Mangalore, "worked with fair attendance, some of the girls coming in the early morning to escape the pickets and some of them coming by climbing over the wall, also to escape the picketeers.[31]

The fire which burned down most of the records, stationery, library books, etc., and some furniture of the office of the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Bhimavaram Range, on 17 August did not agitate him. For, this untoward incident was not connected with any section of students.[38] Likewise, he felt that the political agitation in Vizagapatam had nothing to do with the fire which burned down the thatched shed in the compound of the Municipal High School, Chicacole, on the 16th of the month.[39] The students had nothing to do with the burning down of the thatched shed attached to the Municipal High School and the

damage done to the office of the Deputy Inspector of Schools, both at Nandyal, on 24 and 27 respectively.[40]

The government felt that strong action should be taken against the student revolt and that "under no circumstances should colleges be closed down before their normal dates."[41] But the principal had to fear the student agitation, and he even feared that the situation would go out of his control necessitating the closure of the college. Police firing at Guntur necessitated the closure of ULCM High School and the Andhra Christian College on the 14 and 15 August, on the advice of the Collector. But the DPI noted, with care, the report that the heads of these institutions were "prepared to work as usual in future" so long as the Collector did not ask them to close down these institutions.[42] Taking into account the strike and picketing in the St. Aloysius's College Mangalore, on 21 August, the Collector of South Canara asked whether the college might be closed earlier for Michaelmas. The DPI replied in the affirmative. But the closure of the Madras Christian College on 31 August 1942, greatly annoyed the DPI who reported the incident as follows: "In spite of repeated advice to the contrary, both in person and in writing, both by me and by the Vice-Chancellor of the Madras University, Boyd, Principal of the Madras Christian College, Tambaram, closed his college, this morning."[43]

The bureaucracy always used the same tools to manage even unequal situations at different times. This idea is more evident in the reply of Boyd to the letter of the DPI, who asked the former about the "sort of guarantee his management could give, in regard to accepting the advice of Government in future, if there was further Civil Disobedience trouble."[44] He pointed out in his reply that a very particular situation peculiar to the college, forced the college authorities to take the decision to ante-date the vacation, thus marking a departure from the policy of the government, as contained in the government circular dated 14 August. The majority of the students, numbering five hundred, were staying away from parental control, in the hostels within the college campus. In normal times, this was an advantage. But this element created a special difficulty during times of excitement. And this, explained the Principal, "gave a specially difficult turn to the whole situation, and involved many additional complications."[45] Taking into account the unsteady conditions that prevailed in the educational institutions, contrary to the 'normalcy' reported in the DPI's despatches, the DPI was pressed to take up immediate action. In a circular sent to the heads of the colleges in Madras city, the DPI

expressed regret at the prolongation of abstention from the classes, owing to the political situation of the country. Therefore, the authorities were asked to inform the students that, unless they had valid reasons such as proved ill-health, they should be in regular attendance in their classes from Tuesday, 18 of August.[46] The circular asked the heads of colleges to punish absentees after the 18 of August.

The temporary normalcy that prevailed after 18 August was considered to be the effect of this circular. It will be foolish to imagine that the fire that had seized the student world could be extinguished with the help of a circular. The normalcy that returned after the aforesaid circular eclipsed, and the government repeated the same tactics. The circular sent by the DPI advised the principals of the colleges that "if after the date of the receipt of this circular, students continue to be absent from work for political reasons the students should at once be warned and should be struck off the rolls of the colleges. The names of scholarship-holders and the fee concession-holders who were on strike even after the 26 of August should be reported to the Director of Public Instruction."[47] The managements of the aided colleges were also expected to act according to the advice given. In the beginning of 1943, the government came ahead with its latest announcement referring to the future student strikers. It said that the government would obtain a list of the names of ring leaders and "would issue orders debarring such students from appointment in Government service and if they were members of Government colleges, would also order their expulsion from the colleges."[84] It was only a threat and was not carried out.

The 'Independence Day' celebration lasted only for one day. The students celebrated that day by abstaining from classes and conducting processions and meetings. The subsequent days passed without any untoward events. For this calm, the DPI took pride in his circulars and in the announcement of the government enforcing discipline in the schools and colleges. Peaceful observance of the Independence Day was planned by the organisers. That, and not these announcements, "had prevented the recurrence of strikes and that they may not be more likely to prevent them in future than they have in the past."[49]

The DPI, who took the 1942 rebellion that shook the academic community only as a storm in the tea-cup, seemed to have taken no care of the students who took the agitation to the streets and other nerve centres of the government. It is not an exaggeration to say that the student agitation in response to the August declaration in the first two or three days was on the whole non-violent. But it was only a passing

phase. The reports that appeared daily in the papers about the steady increase in the number of students who were suspended, expelled, fined, and sent to prison or had receive whipping punishment or gun shots, failed to each the cynic eyes of this DPI. Paper reports, the proceedings of the district courts, etc., unravel the story of the student revolt. It is interesting to note why the DPI tried to create smoke-screens of 'normalcy' in the academic environment. This reminds us of a note made by the Director General of Information, New Delhi, in a confidential file. He was cautious not to give any publicity to a list of instances of violence that occurred in the course of four months of the Congress movement in the year 1940. His statement covering details of demonstrations, held on behalf of the Congress, which involved violence, listed only 15 instances, all of which were by no means serious, besides 4,000 arrests.[50] The officer cautioned his men against its publicity because it might give Gandhiji a chance to argue about the "strength of the control which he exercises" over the situation.[51] The DPI had the cheek to announce to the world that the August declaration had failed to make any inpact upon the student community, and that the academic world was normal. But his ignorance of the emotions behind the student activities did not serve him well. He was repeating the blunder of his masters who interned the Congress leaders in order to forestall the August movement, but only to find painfully that the movement was turning a revolution from unexpected corners. However they soon realised that the students were fighting the last phase of India's struggle for freedom.

The tempo of these anti-British activities was kept steady throughout the year, except by the return of the temporary normalcy owing to the closure of the educational institutions by the authorities or to the break during the Michaelmas, Onam or Christmas vacations. Educational authorities persuaded the students to call off the strike either by appealing to their reason or by threats. A demonstration of about 1,500 students of the St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, was held in the morning of August 17.[52] Mr Chettur, the District Magistrate, appeled to the students to disperse peacefully and granted their request for permission to hold a meeting and to go in procession. The students went peacefully in procession and held a meeting at the Town Hall Square. The prompt and tactful intervention of Chettur led to the peaceful conclusion of the demonstrations.

Principals like H.C. Papworth of the Presidency College felt that the observance of hartal by the college students since 9 August was an

eloquent expression of their protest against the arrest of the national leaders. Papworth appreciated the quietly-held hartal. But he expressed doubt that the effect and purpose of the hartal would gradually and inevitably be lost if it were not called off in time as it was done in other places. He called upon his students to "realise the effectiveness of the gesture" which no one would interpret as "a surrender of deep feelings." Students were also informed that no action would be taken against them on their return.[53]

But the authorities who meted out physical punishments to students also relied upon the help of circulars threatening them with disciplinary action. The Government communique of 2 September 1942 can be cited as an example. The principals of government and aided colleges were instructed to warn their students against absenteeism without valid reasons. In their communique the government had stated that if, after the warning, the students did not immediately return to classes, their names would be removed from the rolls. All the city colleges in response to the government communique warned their students and put the deadline for the resumption of their work on 7 September. The Christian College authorities issued a pledge to the effect that the "students would not leave or encourage others to do so, that they would do nothing which, in the opinion of the authorities, might seriously interfere with or interrupt their studies and that they would, in all circumstances, respect and support the discipline of the college."[54]

This pledge was also sent to the parents, to be signed by the students and countersigned by their parents or guardians. As an overall effect of these measures, normalcy returned. The city students, who otherwise resolved to carry on strike for an indefinite period, called off the strike "somewhat tardily."[55] Though the students of the City Medical College and Stanley Medical College decided to go back to the classes, the way in which they honoured the National Flag demonstrated their intense patriotism. In addition to the warning against absenteeism, the principals of both the medical colleges demanded the removal of the National Flag flying aloft in the hostel premises for several days. The principal later issued an ultimatum granting forty-eight hours for the removal of "all unauthorised exhibits such as unofficial flags."[56] On 6 September, the Madras Medical College students resolved to honour the government communique. But they emptied their hostel. Working strenuously throughout the early hours of 7 September, the hostelers of the City Medical College removed their belongings from their rooms and dumped them on the roadside, beyond the hostel compound, to be

later conveyed to certain temporary lodgings. About dawn, they gathered together for prayer near the flag staff, brought the banner down and carried it to the roadside.

Their counterparts in the women's hostel attached to the Stanley Medical College, too, did the same . The flag which was flown over the blocks of the Ladies' hostel was taken out in procession to the Men's hostel and was handed over to the men students. However, they continued to stay in the hostel. This is also an example of how the professors and teachers were made use of, to crush the patriotism and idealism that bubbled within the hearts of the students.

In the course of a communication, the retired principal of the Pachaiyappa's College, Professor S.D. Sarma, deplored that the Government Order, requiring the students to resume work from 7 September, was too drastic a measure which worsened the situation in the city colleges. He developed his arguments on two points. Those students who wanted to attend the classes, were prevented from doing so owing to a sense of *esprit de corps*, generated in them by appeals made to them by their fellow students, in the name of unity, patriotism, etc.[57] Then he pointed out that it was unreasonable to expect the minds of young people, which were highly inflammable, to become sober by threats or precipitate action.[58]

True to this, the return of normalcy was proved to be short-lived, when the emotion of the students was stirred up by the revolting forms of punishment meted out to university students. Two students of the Loyola College, T.R. Thathachari and K.S. Raghavan, aged 16 and 17 years respectively, were sentenced by the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Saidapet, to receive 15 stripes each. This was for throwing stones at the train and for trespassing into the railway line between Chetput and Kodambakkam railway stations, on 3 September 1942.[59] This marked the end of the temporary cessation of the strike. Students met in conference at various centres and passed a number of resolutions in protest. Students of the Annamalai University took the lead in this agitation.[60]

The policy of the Government of Madras, with regard to the punishment of whipping, was clarified by L.S. Amery, Secretary of State for India, in the House of Commons on 10 September 1942. The penalties (Enhancement) Ordinance, issued by the Governor-General early in 1942, as an emergency measure, "enabled any province to adopt whipping as penalty for rioting and crimes of bodily violence, arson or sabotage,"[61] resulting in injury to person or property.

The Government of Madras issued an order, instructing the concerned authorities on the policies to be followed, in the event of student demonstrations and strikes connected with the 1942 movement. They were as follows:

"(1) Where an offence against law is committed the offender student otherwise must be dealt with under the law.

(2) Whenever the police arrest students for these offences the college authorities should be informed so that they may, if so disposed, offer evidence of character etc., in the Magistrate's court.

(3) In the event or Mr Gandhi's death (i) students will not be punished for non-attendance on the day of his death and on the day of his funeral provided that they create no distrubances. If, on other days, non-attendance is general, or disturbances occur, colleges and schools may be closed *sine die*. Such action should however be taken only after reference to, and express orders from, the Government. The DPI has been asked to advise principals and headmasters of private schools and colleges to take similar action. (ii) Public meetings and processions will be governed by the instructions already issued by the District Magistrates and the Commissioner of Police. (iii) Meetings in school or college premises may be allowed on the same conditions as public meetings, i.e., the organisers should satisfy the head of the institution that the meeting will not be made an occasion for unrestrained attack on Government or for the incitement of disorder. Heads of institutions may consult District Magistrates when necessary."[62]

The active part played by the teachers and students in the August rebellion, and the closure of the educational institutions in large numbes all over India, became a major issue to be tackled by the government. In its analysis the government could find that "this participation ranged from organised sabotage and other serious breaches of the peace down to protests of a non-violent character like the closing of institutions or the absenteeism of students."[63] Some governments issued orders of expulsion or rustication of college students. Some students were severely warned whereas others were deprived of scholarships, concessions, etc. Their names were struck off the rolls. Students prominent in demonstrations were debarred from examinations and black listed for appointments. These orders were principally meant to deal with students themselves. Another set of orders booked parents and guardians by imposing collective fines on them. Such orders also placed responsibility on parents and sought their cooperation in persuading their wards to return to school. Some other orders

either closed down the striking institutions or forfeited their grants. The Government viewed that the failure to check the general deterioration in the standard of discipline in the educational institutions would result in a "loss of study time and a waste of public money, which no one interested in the future of Indian education can contemplate with equanimity."[64] With the general appreciation of the situation, the Government of India laid down certain principles, subject to the concurrence of provincial governments, with a view to formulating a general policy for dealing with things as presented at that time and to tone up the standard of discipline in the educational institutions particularly in the universities for the future.[65]

The quintessence of suggestions proposed by the central government to achieve academic peace had both short-term and long-term aspects. As far as the short-term policy was concerned, the following measures were proposed: "(i) Teachers convicted of breaking the law should be blacklisted, so far as future employment in institutions maintained or aided out of public funds are concerned. (ii) Students similarly convicted should, according to the gravity of their offences, be declared ineligible to proceed to their degrees either for a specified period or altogether. (iii) Students who continue to absent themselves without good cause should be struck off the rolls and those who have incurred disabilities through absence should not be relieved."[66] As far as the long-term policy was concerned the government regarded the re-organization of the educational system, particularly in its higher stages, to be the best hope for the future.[67]

Various clauses under the Defence of India Rules, sections under the Indian Penal Code, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, the Madras Children Act, the Public Security Act, the Criminal Proceedings Act, and the Nuisance Act, were made use of by the District Magistrates and Police authorities, to convict the students for their political activities. Many unbiased judges condemned these measures and took the bureaucracy to task. W.O. Newsam ICS, was an example. Following certain speeches made at a public meeting at Chittoor on 10 August 1942, five persons, three of whom were students, were convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment by the Divisional First Class Magistrate, Chittoor, under Section 17 (1) of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. But they were acquitted on appeal by W.O. Newsam, the District Session Judge.

In his judgement he had remarked: "It is manifestly wrong to identify the activities of the AICC with a students' revolt against authority. A

students' revolt may be a consequence of those activities – a consequence which might well have been anticipated – but there is no real foundation for the inference that this unfortunate consequence was a part of the programme of the AICC."[68] The judge inferred that the programmes advocated by the boys were only exercises in imitation of their elders. Such programmes were adumbrated in these "meetings of unruly students," owing to very different sources. He had ruled out that the word 'Swadeshi' was borrowed from previous campaigns, and that travelling without tickets and pulling alarm chains was a "typically immature pastime." "But the dislocation of communications by the telephone, telegraph, road and rail, and the organization of strikes in factories are plainly inspired by enemy wireless propaganda."[69] The students could hardly understand the Indian problem, in the background of world problems. In concluding the judgement, the judge said: "It is plain, in my opinion, that Section 17 (1) of the Criminal Law Amendment Act does not apply to the activities of the appellants, for they cannot be said to have helped the operations of unlawful associations. On the contrary they have inconsiderably brought discredit and dismay to their parents and their teachers and done themselves incalculable harm by a public exhibition of hysterics and bravado."[70]

Sir Maurice Hallett, addressing the Central Educational Advisory Committee, said that the part played by the student community in the movement which the Congress party attempted to start in August, led him to think at one time that "there appeared to be no alternative but to close down"[71] the Benares University. Actually the university was compelled to close down because the military men marched into the premises and took possession, ousting the students, with all its brutal accompaniments. According to Govind Sahai, "This was the first instance in human history, when a seat of learning of the eminence of the Hindu University was subjected to such humiliation."[72] However, there was no justification whatever for this highhanded action of the narrow, illiberal and out-of-date mentality of Sir Maurice, who himself stood self-convicted.

The principal of the Madras Christian College, observed with reference to the student unrest that "students did not live in sealed chambers, and the older among them at any rate could hardly be expected to show no signs of awareness when the national life was disturbed and storms were raging."[73] There will be general agreement with Mr Boyd's further remark that attempts to organize the student body for 'direct action' could not be approved by anybody who wished them well. That,

however, does not alter the fact that in times of excitement what is called for on the part of the educational authorities is tact as well as patience and firmness, and that they have the best chance of succeeding when the government or other external authority interferes least. As far as university students are concerned, discipline should be regarded as entirely an internal matter. If that had been done at Benares, the university authorities would have had no difficulty in handling the situation and preventing serious mischief.

Further, on another occasion, the Governor referred to the disturbances as 'a wave of crime,' which accompanied rebellion as contemplated by the originators. The phase of open violence, he said, "has not in any manner been disowned by its originators, it has gone underground."[74] The government might have been aware of the fact that violence driven underground was notoriously difficult to scotch, as experienced in their entanglement with the Bengal terrorists.

The logic of the British Government in finding fault with the Congress for the violent turn of the revolution is curious. They had developed a thesis in which the Congress was made responsible for the violence.[75] By putting the champion of non-violence and his followers behind the bars, the government was, unknowingly, releasing the forces of violence. Really this was the fact. The Congressmen who were either left out by the police or had escaped from their eyes, went underground. The students and the working class who smelt danger in the Congress arrests came to the forefront of the movement. The British Government thought that they could arrest the movement itself by removing the leaders. But by unleashing the reign of repression, they actually added fuel to the fire. This sentiment was confirmed by Horace Alexander, a reputed British journalist, who had the opportunity to tour India during that epoch-making period. He said that it was "repression let loose by the police that goaded to violent fury, crowds that have intended to act quite peacefully."[76]

The reference to the Congress as the originator of the disturbances only betrayed the elementary incapacity of the British to tackle a situation which was largely their own making. At the same time, the impact of the pamphlets and leaflets, urging the students to burst in revolt, broadcast by the underground Congressmen and other revolutionaries cannot be ignored.[77] The instructions which were issued to the Telugu District Congress Committee by the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, towards the end of July 1942, contained a list of methods which breathed violence culminating in out-

right revolution. Programmes of work for the attainment of complete independence as listed in it were as follows: cut out telephone and telegraph wires, travel in trains without tickets and while doing so, pull the chain and stop the trains, remove rails and demolish bridges, picket police stations and government offices and force the government servants to resign the jobs, organize hartals, picket the toddy and arrack depots and foreign cloth shops, impede the war efforts of the government,[78] etc. Instructions, identical to those of the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, were also circulated by the Tamilnadu Provincial Congress Committee. It was found that they were issued before the August declaration of the AICC and the Government of Madras firmly believed that "the attacks upon Government and railway property, accompanied by arson and other violence, which have occurred in different places throughout the Presidency, were the work of local hooligans and could never have been sanctioned by the Congress leaders. . ."[79]

The Utkal Congress Bulletin called the schools and colleges the fortresses of the enemies and urged that they should be kept locked until independence. It exhorted each student to assume the leadership of the revolution and face bullets and lathis like a revolutionary.[80] It also condemned as a stain on Orissa, those students who were busy with their studies "with a view to act as screws of the Government's exploiting machinery."[81] Another circular urged the students to root out all the symbols of the government, to spread about all around, to set fire to the police stations and courts, to sabotage railways and telecommunications, to penetrate to the villages and kindle the spark of revolution among the masses, kindle the fire of disorder by appealing to the Indian officials and the police to resign their office.[82] A notice in wide circulation entitled 'Programme for Students' asked the students to take the Independence Pledge and declare themselves members of the Congress. In order to ensure that meetings were well-attended till the end, the surrounding areas were to be barricaded. Students were not to vacate hostels when asked to do so, but should get ejected by force by the police. In case they were sent out of the hostels by force, the leaflet said, they could occupy the local choultries or get billeted anywhere. Then the students were asked to divide themselves into batches and to organize processions in the city or in the nearby villages. Then the villagers were to be taught to blockade the roads by digging trenches or by felling trees across the road.[83] Also they were to be told not to pay taxes till the establishment of a Free Government. The

students were given the liberty to destroy the village records, and in this the Karnam and the Village Munsif were to be won either by persuasion or by compulsion.[84] Students were then asked to cooperate in labour unions and help them in their strikes. The city-dwellers were to be pursuaded not to buy or sell anything except food. And also, the boys should be persuaded to stop playing foreign sports and in case they did not, the materials were to be smashed. In regard to the methods of organizing ticketless travel, the students were to get the necessary hints from the leading Congressmen. On the reverse of the notice, the Madras students were exhorted to strike not merely to protest against the arrest of the leaders, but also to participate in the national revolt. The notice continued, "You do not know your own power. Once you join in the National Movement, you will find that you can make the Government rock as if under an earthquake."[85] The notice concluded by saying that India without Mahatma Gandhi was like Ayodhya without Rama. When Mahatma Gandhi was arrested, the Indian citizens were destined to do what the citizens of Ayodhya did by deserting the land rather than by submitting to humiliation.[86]

In a statement to the press, C. Rajagopalachari protested strongly against the policy, worse than the scorched-earth policy, put into practice in the name of the Congress by men claiming to be patriotic. He said that unsigned slips of paper programmed with sabotage of public property, arson, and deliberate dislocation of social order, were being circulated widely by hand. It was clothed in Gandhiji's language in order to create the semblance of authority of an ordered movement. Rajaji warned that such wanton destruction would not bring Swaraj of any type, or, further the programme of Gandhi.[87] This came from one of Gandhiji's men who disagreed with Gandhiji's plan of the 1942 rebellion and tried to deflect him from that. Rajaji considered that those who thought that they were helping Gandhiji in his plan were in reality deluding themselves, and he felt it his duty to remove this delusion from the minds of the people.[88]

Appanna and six other youngmen were tried on the charge of setting fire to the Municipal High School building at Hospet on 10 September. From the statement made by the prosecution witnesses in the court, it could be assumed that students, left alone, were not responsible for their violent activities. Hanumanthu, a student and a prosecution witness in this case, said that the students were reading reports about burning of buildings in other places, from the Kannada daily *Samyukta Karnataka*.[89] Halugappa, another high school student, referred to a

leaflet addressed to the students, merchants and others, to join the civil disobedience movement.[90]

Similar sentiments were expressed by Virupaksha Reddi, a prosecution witness in the Hospet arson case, in his evidence before the Sub-divisional Magistrate in Hospet. "In none of the public meetings subsequent to the arrest of Gandhiji, acts of sabotage were advocated by the speakers. He did not know what the Congress programme in furtherance of the civil disobedience movement was. After the incident regarding the attempted removal of rails at Hospet he thought that the Congress people secretly encouraged acts of sabotage, though outwardly they did not advocate the same."[91]

The Communists, Muslims, the upper classes, the Indian soldiers, bureaucrats and the police remained aloof. But the nationalists among them either resigned from the group they belonged to or extended their cooperation to the nationalist cause.

The influence of the Communist creed on the student organization was rather significant. But the Communist elements attempted to dragoon the student community to meet their own interests. In the districts of Andhra, especially in Guntur and East Godavari, the Communists were rallying their forces to start Kisan Sabhas, rivalling the existing organizations controlled by N.G. Ranga.[92] Discontent set in the mind of the pro-Congress students among the Communist-controlled student organizations, in respect of their altered pro-war policy. The lifting of the ban on the Communist Party alienated the pro-Congress youths from that party. When the ban order was clamped down on the Andhra Pradesh Congress Committee in August 1942, these pro-Congress youths were deprived of an open and legal platform to carry out their revolutionary activities. The need of the hour was the formation of a cover organization, and thereby the defeat of the ban imposed on them. This need was fulfilled with the formation of the Provisional Committee (Andhra Branch) of the National Youth League at Bezwada. This organization realigned all action groups comprising Communist renegades, Congress socialists, Trotskyist "wreckers", followers of N.G. Ranga, Congressmen and Forward Bloc agitators. Preparing the youth to work for the speedy attainment of national independence by implementing Congress programmes was the chief object of the League.

The Congress All India Centre at Bombay sent emissaries to Andhra in January 1943 to study the situation. During their stay in Andhra, they toured Kistna and Guntur and met some Communist dissidents like

Surapaneni Seshagiri Rao, Prathivadi Bhayankara Venkatachari who was later sentenced to life imprisonment in the Kakinada Bomb case, and others. Sponsored by the above two young men, this organization was started under the inspiration of the underground Congress headquarters at Bombay. S.R. Kulkarni, who assumed the pseudonym of S. Ranga Rao, was one among the emissaries deputed by the Congress headquarters to organize the Andhra Youth. During his stay in Andhra in January 1943, he called on Rameshagiri and others at Bezwada. He was arrested by the police on 2 April 1943. His letter dated 17 February 1943 sheds some light on the nature of work done and the work envisaged to be done. Also, it revealed its affinity with the Congress and the Congress socialist party.[93]

Under instructions of the All India Congress Committee at Bombay, a secret meeting of the important workers known as the "Andhra Planning Committee" was held at Bezwada on 25 February 1943. The programme, as it emanated from this gathering, was to organize National Youth League branches and its auxiliaries such as National Students' Association and National Labour Union, on a provincial basis and to re-orient and further the Congress programme by covert or overt means.[94] It was also decided to rally the revolutionary forces in order to bring about a national revolution. A directorate, with M. Satnarain, S. Rameshagiri Rao and B. Subba Rao, was formed to carry out organizational activities and to obtain funds for its functioning.[95] As for the future work, the emissary from the Central Committee chalked out the following scheme: "(1) satyagraha and filling of jails according to the old programme, (2) arranging batches of ten volunteers in each taluk for propaganda and to increase membership, (3) to have a squad of 60 youths in each district ready to undertake "big programme" and in the event of upheaval like the August rebellion, to guide the people, and (4) to conduct salt satyagraha in Nellore district."[96] This organization was directed and financed by the Congress headquarters at Bombay.[97] Apart from that, a National Youth League Fund was started to run the paper, *Viplava Jwala*, an organ of the League.

Close CID surveillance had unearthed the revolutionary nature of the National Youth League. An incomplete report on the condition in the province, prepared by the League, confirmed its responsibility for the bomb explosions in Guntur and Bezwada. The report also brought to light the close link of the League workers with the terrorist movement in the ceded districts and also with the Jammulamadugu Mail

Robbery.[98] The statement given by P. Venkanna to the police, on interrogation, revealed the existence of a secret conspiracy of amassing arms and explosive materials for terrorist activities.[99]

The nationalist-minded students of the Students' Federation either supported the Congress programme or quitted their party to join the nationalist wing. This was very evident in Maharashtra, Gujarat, C.P., Berar, Indore, Kerala and Andhra, where the affiliated units, disaffiliated themselves from the AISF (Red) and joined the struggle.[100] In many places meetings were held under the joint auspices of the Communist and nationalist students. On 13 August, some Communists and students announced the holding of a meeting at the Mainguard square at Madura, to protest against the arrest of the Congress leaders. A strong police party prevented it. An unfortunate sequel followed when the police opened fire on the hostile crowd. Five persons died on the spot and eighteen sustained gunshot injuries.[101] In Calicut, the Communists held a public meeting on 17 August, which demanded the unconditional and immediate release of the Congress leaders and passed a resolution protesting against the cane charge by the police, on the students of the Malabar Christian College hostel.[102] Again on 13 September, a resolution was passed unanimously at a meeting held under the joint auspices of the Central Council of Trade Unions, Calicut, and the Kerala Students' Federation protesting against the suspension of some students of the local educational institutions and requesting the authorities to cancel the suspension orders.[103] The Kerala Students' Federation organized a meeting at Mudalakulam Maidan on 21 September, in connection with the All Kerala Protest Day. Resolutions protesting against repression towards the student population, and demanding the readmission of all suspended students in Calicut, were passed.[104]

The representative character of the Kerala branch of the AISF was noticeable at a conference of students held at Sreenarayana park on October 12, presided over by K.P. Karunakaran, an expelled student. It condemned the policy that it had followed since its formation and held that it was contrary to the views held by the majority of the students. Its attitude towards the Congress was also criticised. The result was that a new organization to be called the Chirakkal Taluk National Students' Association came into being. It was also resolved to affiliate this Association to the new All-Kerala National Students' Association. As evident from a resolution that it passed, the conference held the view that the "United Nations could win the war only if India

was declared free and a provisional National Government was formed."[105] Government was requested to release the national leaders, and the students and teachers were exhorted to bring pressure on the government towards this. Deep concern was expressed in the last resolution over the policy of the educational authorities towards the participation of students in the nationalist movement, and the cancellation of the government orders concerned with their activities. Thirty-five students of the Tellicherry branch of the All-Kerala Students' Federation resigned their membership in it.[106] They expressed complete disagreement with the attitude and policy of the Federation in respect of certain matters. A long manifesto, issued by the newly organized Tellicherry National Students' Union, condemned the Federation for its "anti-national" attitude and dubbed it to be the students' branch of the Indian Communist Party.

In the thick of the Quit India movement, several Communist leaders from different places were arrested. The arrests of G. Venkata Reddi, who was the organizer of the Kurnool District Students' Federation, Baladandayutham and K. Diraviyam were notable. C.M. Yagnamurthy Namboodiripad, who was detained in the central prison, was externed from the state. R. Menon from Kerala and Sunder Rao from Andhra were prominent among those who renounced their membership as a protest against the "treacherous policy" followed by the Communists.[107] All these show the extent to which the nationalist faction of the Communist Party supported the 1942 rebellion.

The Working Committee of the Indian Muslim Students' Federation, held a meeting at New Delhi on 1 September 1942, under the Chairmanship of the Raja Sahib of Mahmudabad. The committee advised the Muslim students to keep aloof from the Congress movement. It also warned the Hindu students "not to intimidate, coerce or molest the Muslim students, as otherwise the Muslim students will be compelled to offer resistance and adopt all such measures as may be necessary for self-defence and safeguarding their self-respect."[108] The Malabar Muslim Students' Federation considered Pakistan as the only destiny of the Muslims in India. A resolution to that effect was passed in its conference held at Calicut under the Presidentship of Haji Abdur Sathar Sait, MLA (Central).

But the advice given by Dr Khan Sahib, ex-P.M., to the Frontier Students Union, on 18 September 1942, was just to the contrary. He advised them to keep off the entangling cobweb of communalism and to become builders of modern India "as an organized, ordered and

disciplined body." He declared it to be the duty of the youth to eradicate the "bane of communalism and lay the foundation of a new brotherhood of Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians and Parsis." Proceeding, he disapproved of violence and said that it was not an index of bravery. He considered that "non-violence was the highest form of bravery. Fear and cowardice went together; therefore, they ought to be eliminated." At the dawn of freedom which he said was approaching, the task of the youths was to "bring this freedom quickly but safely to their motherland."[109]

The Christian students identified themselves whole heartedly with India's national aspirations. This was very evident in the resolution passed at the conclusion of the 13th annual camp of the Mysore Student Christian Movement held at Bangalore from 9 to 12 October under the leadership of G.V. Job. The resolution said: ". . . we extend our sympathy to all students who are suffering for their convictions, and we hope that the day of freedom and justice, for which they are paying the price, may soon dawn, not only over this country but throughout the world. We urge our fellow students to join with us in working constructively and praying increasingly that God's will be done."[110]

Another resolution was passed at the 8th annual camp of the Student Christian Movement Conference (Madras – Vellore) held at the local St. Columba's High School, presided over by Dr Malcolm S. Adiseshia[111] of the Economics Department of the Madras Christian College in 1942. The resolution regarded the repressive policy of the government as barren and sympathised with those students all over India "who with self-sacrifice and heroism were suffering for their convictions and for vindicating their country's honour."[112] The resolution also expressed hope that the day of justice, freedom and peace for which they were fighting might soon dawn not only in India but throughout the world.[113] Government was also urged to cooperate with those endeavours aimed at ending the deadlock.

Again, in a letter, Janaki Moses, Tambaram, wrote with reference to the fast begun by Gandhiji, "Mahatmaji is in the throes of death. God worked no miracle to save Jesus and we stand beholding the great calamity with bleeding hearts as the lovers of the kingdom of God did in days of old. We have no weapons of steel to fight with, but have we lost hope? The life of Nazarene was no failure but a glorious victory and so today Mahatma Gandhi has won and through him the world will realise the practicability of living up to the teachings of Christ.[114] She appealed in this letter to various Christian organizations such as YMCA,

YWCA, Students' Christian Union, to the leaders of the Churches and heads of Christian institutions, to send an urgent appeal to the viceroy as well as to the British Premier, to release Mahatma Gandhi.

But in another resolution adopted at the meeting of the Loyola College Debating Society on November 6, the release of national leaders and the establishment of a National Government at the centre were considered to be the essential steps for the settlement of the deadlock in the country.[115] Dr P. Subharoyan, who was not in favour of starting the Civil Disobedience Movement at a time while the threat of the Axis Powers continued, was present as an observer. He cast his vote against the resolution. However, he blamed the government for precipitating a student strike, by arresting the leaders after the adoption of the AICC resolution.

A general-body meeting of the Trichinopoly District Teachers' Guild was held on November 1942, at which a resolution was passed appealing to the government to take early steps to settle the political deadlock of the time, in order to ensure the return of a peaceful and harmonious atmosphere, which was essential for the mobilisation of the nation's united effort in the cause of democracy and justice. The resolution also expressed serious concern over the way in which the day-to-day work in the educational institutions was hampered by the political situation in the country, causing 'a feeling of bitterness' on the part of the students, humiliated by whipping and other sentences for taking part in strikes.[116]

A conference of the International Students' Assembly, representing 38 nations, was held at Washington on 5 September 1942. The gathering urged the British to open negotiations with the Indian people for granting them political freedom. A resolution to that effect was passed by the Assembly. Chandrasekhar, a former president of the AISF, represented the Assembly as the delegate of anti-Axis forces. He declared that he was not "anti-British but pro-India and therefore pro-humanity."[117] He called upon the assembly to demand Indian independence. The Indian problem, if solved, would, he said, affect a fifth of the world's population, which would mobilise the Indian people to fight Germany, Italy and Japan. Further, he urged that Roosevelt, Chiang Kai Shek and Stalin should join in promising freedom for India.[118] The delegation of the United States recommended the granting of immediate independence for India.[119]

Students are by nature rebellious and they showed this quality in responding to the call of the nation. In the course of the movement

many students were killed, fatally wounded, jailed; many suffered persecution or were thrown out of the educational institutions. But the tremor they created rocked the British administration to its foundations and left an everlasting mark.

Several students were killed on the spot when the police opened fire on student processionists at Guntur and Madura in the south, and many places in north India. The story of Veershankar of Nagpur, Hemu Kalani of Sind, Vinod Kanarivala of Gujarat, Ballol Vasudev of Maharashtra, Kanakalava of Assam, Shankarappa of Mysore, and Raj Narain Misra of Madhya Pradesh, gave new dimensions to the student heroism which reached its pinnacle during the struggle.[120]

Navinchand Iswarlal Shroff, a nineteen-year old student of Zamorin's College, Calicut, attained martyrdom, as a prisoner in police custody. When he was sentenced to a fine of Rs 75, or in default to three months' imprisonment, he chose the latter. He dissuaded his mother, who went to the court to remit the fine, with these words: "Mother, if you pay the fine, you will never see your son Naveen alive."[121] He was placed in "C" class and was sent to Alipur Jail. The jail proved to be his grave. He grew weak and fell ill. He was treated for malaria, whereas he was suffering from typhoid. The unwholesome food and inadequate medical aid in the prison, took away the life of this brave boy, on the eve of the New Year, 1943.

At Kollengode, on 10 August, the police fired at student demonstrators when they refused to disperse. Some of the students even "unbuttoned their shirts and exposed their chests to the loaded revolvers, in quite a non-chalant manner."[122] The British stained their hands with the blood of the martyrs and they were quick to learn that the new generation would be up in arms unless they quitted.

Jayaprakash Narayan who was in Hazaribagh jail during the height of the movement, said after his escape from that jail, that the part played by the students in the first phase of the movement was notable. He saw that after reaching its height, the revolution experienced a period of low tide, only to rise to new heights. He attributed the lull in the movement after its successful turnout in the first phase, to the lack of efficient organization and of a complete programme of national revolution.[123] He thought of renewing the fight and found that the students who were back to the educational institutions, after the successful turnout of the first phase of the fight, were not dispirited, and hoped that they would soon take up responsibilities to lead a revolt of the labour, police and armed forces. He sought their help in this second

and last major offensive. In an appeal to the student world he said: "We have not much time before us and therefore we must not lose a moment. In every field of preparation we need your help. We have to work in the villages and industrial centres, on the railways and in the mines, in the army and the services, we have to publish and distribute our literature, maintain our contacts and communications. We have to raise and train a militia and bands of the technical workers for sabotage... and we have to continue our present clashes and skirmishes with the enemy."[124] Jayaprakash began to build up a network under a coordinated and central command. At the time of the next offensive for the complete rout of the enemy, he appealed to the student community to take the front line in the battle once again as they did in August. Though Jayaprakash became a legendary leader among the students, who taught them how to make and use bombs, and practise guerilla war tactics, he was too late to come into their midst. He backed the fervent call of Gandhiji. His efforts to raise a revolution were constantly thwarted by the search after his "escape". Hence he failed to lead the historic revolution that was launched by him.

Though the upsurge engulfed the entire educational institutions spread over the length and breadth of the nation, the strength of the movement fluctuated from time to time and from region to region. The Quit India movement was started when Gandhiji was incarcerated and the movement came to an end with his release from jail. The first two days, when grief overtook the nation, the movement was rather non-violent. The entire student community expressed their sympathy in different ways. Revolution followed when their peaceful movement was hindered by governmental repression. The student revolution shook the edifice of the British raj. Since the students felt that they had fulfilled the task, they withdrew themselves from the movement. They were pressurised through their parents and college authorities to go back to the college and resume their studies. Unlike the previous agitational campaigns, the Quit India movement offered the student community an unprecedented role to play. Theirs was an active and important role as far as the class of intelligentsia taken as a whole[125] was concerned. The appeal made to the students by the character and course of the movement was dramatic and powerful.[126] As to their glorious role in this movement, there was no difference of opinion even among the official spokesmen.[127] From the foregoing analysis it follows that the students provided the leadership to a revolt which has been appropriately described as "a student-peasant-middle class rebel-

lion."[128] The range between the estimates of the Congress and the Government[129] of India, of the persons killed by police firing, bombing and other attrocities, and the loss of public property, is rather wide. They were either over-estimated or under-estimated. The complex nature of the movement and its widespread character makes even a reasonable guess difficult. But one thing is sure that the student movement, an arm of the national movement, successfully resisted government repression. The resistance was directly proportional to the repression. Except for the first few days, the Gandhian techniques were relegated to the background giving way to violent methods of agitation. Though Gandhian philosophy attracted the students, their faculty came under the influence of the everchanging national and international political forces. They realized their role in the liberation movement, from the previous agitational campaigns in India as well as from the pages of world history. They could not remain mere onlookers when their leaders were arrested and put behind the bars, and they started emptying their educational institutions in response to the call of Gandhiji, who appealed to them to launch a final struggle unto death. In a variety of ways they fought for the cause of freedom. They served as a veritable link between the underground Congress leaders and the labour as well as peasants who were the fighting force. Violent methods advocated by the Congress Socialists assumed greater proportions in the hands of the students. Their action had regional variations in intensity. Unlike on the previous occasions students dared to fight and die, or court arrest with pride.

On the eve of the Quit India movement, the student community received considerable training from their party factions. In this regard the training given to them by the Communist Party is commendable. The Communists, in the many study-classes they held, instructed them well. The students who came out of such classes were resolute and firm in their action compated with the Congress volunteers[130] who were not at all trained on such lines.

The part played by the girl students is also noteworthy. They fought the battle for freedom shoulder to shoulder with the boys. In the Madras Presidency they created many sensational scenes. When Gandhiji took to fast, girls prayed for his health. Many fell unconscious on such occasions. This created great sensation throughout the country. Another important feature was that the nationalist students, irrespective of party affiliations, came forward in the hour of peril. These students maintained the tempo of the movement when the

Congressmen were put beind the bars. Many students who participated in the movement took up political responsibilities in independent India.

Notes and References

1. Ambaprasad, *The Indian Revolt of 1942,* p. 77.
2. Jawaharlal Nehru, *Discovery of India,* p. 485.
3. For the text of the Quit India resolution adopted by the AICC at Bombay on 8 August 1942, see A. Moin Zaidi, *The Way Out to Freedom,* pp. 220-224.
4. D.G. Tendulkar, *Mahatma — Life of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi,* vol. VI, pp. 202-203.
5. For the text, *Gandhiji's Correspondence with the Government 1942-44,* pp. 285-288.
6. *Ibid,* p. 214; also *The Daily Gazettee,* 23 September, p. 124.
7. *Instruction to PCC from the AICC;* Home, Pol. (Internal) WKW. 3/31/42-1942, NAI.
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ibid.*
10. Ramaswami and L. Natarajan, *Gandhi Malar Manavarukku,* (Tamil translation), p. 50; also Anand, T. Hingorani (ed.), *To the Students by Mahatma Gandhi.*
11. *Ibid.*, p. 28
12. *Ibid.*, pp.172-173.
13. The statement to the press: dated Calcutta 16 August 1942, says: "The AISF calls upon the students all over the country to protest in an organised manner against Government action, and demands of the Government the release of national leaders and to negotiate with the Congress on the basis of freedom, for the establishment of a National Government. The AISF also calls upon the non-Congress parties, especially the Muslim League to join with the progressive forces, AITUC, AISF and AIKS in unitedly demanding the release of all national leaders, and the opening of the negotiations for the setting up of a National Government. Let the Government know, that whatever be their differences with the Congress, they all stand unitedly behind the Congress, they demand which are recognition of freedom and National Government enjoying the confidence of the people.

    In conclusion, the AISF ask students not to fall prey to provocation as violence will lead to national suicide, *vide, Modern Review,* September 1942, p. 212.
14. *AISF. Circular No, 37/42,* 15 August 1942; Home, Pol. (Internal) Secret, 22à/42, NAI.

15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*
18. See Tarachand, *History of the Freedom Movement in India*, Vol. IV, p. 380; D.A. Low (ed.), *op.cit.*, p. 420.
19. B.S. Baliga, *Studies in Madras Administration*, Vol. I, pp. 20-24.
20. Madras Government, *District Calendar of Events of the CDM*, August-December 1942, p. 6.
21. *Fortnightly Reports*, 25 August 1942.
22. *Ibid.*, 25 September 1942.
23. *The Hindu*, 15 August 1942.
24. Arun Chandra Bhuyan, *The Quit India Movement*, p. 74.
25. *The Hindu*, 11 September 1942.
26. *Fortnightly Reports*, 23 October 1942.
27. *Ibid.*, 6 January 1942.
28. Manmathnath Gupta, *History of the Indian Revolutionary Movement*, p. 210.
29. *Fortnightly Reports*, 8 March 1943.
30. *District Calendar of Events of the CDM:* August-December 1942, p. 54.
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Ibid.*, p. 55.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
35. Confidential D.O. from the DPI, Madras, 10 August 1942 to T. Austin, Adviser to H.E. the Governor, dated 10 August 1942, G.O. No. 857, Education, (Confidential), 22 June 1943, TNA.
36. D.O., 23 August 1942, *Ibid.*
37. D.O., 24 August 1942, *Ibid.*
38. D.O., 25 August 1942, *Ibid.*
39. *Ibid.*
40. D.O., 30 August 1942, *Ibid.*
41. D.O., 28 August 1942, *Ibid.*
42. D.O., 18 August 1942, *Ibid.*
43. D.O., 31 August 1942, *Ibid.*
44. D.O., 18 December 1942, *Ibid.*
45. Copy Confidential D.O., 14 December 1942 from the Principal, Madras Christian College, Tambaram (Rev. A.J. Boyd), addressed to the DPI, Madras, *Ibid.*
46. Circular dated August 1942 to the Heads of all Colleges in Madras, including the Christian College at Tambaram, Teachers' College, Saidapet and Engineering College, Guindy, *Ibid.*
47. Circular No. 39/42, 30 August 1942 to the Principals of all aided colleges, *Ibid.*

48. Note, 9 February 1943, *Ibid.*
49. *Ibid.*
50. G.O. No. 516, Public Department, (Gl.), Confidential, 10 March 1941, TNA
51. *Ibid.*
52. *The Hindu,* 18 August 1942.
53. *Ibid.*
54. *The Hindu*, 2 September 1942.
55. *Fortnightly Reports,* 25 September 1942.
56. *The Hindu*, 7 September 1942; also see A. Moin Zaidi, *op.cit.*, p. 100.
57. *The Hindu*, 7 September 1942.
59. *Ibid.*, 19 September 1942; also A. Moin Zaidi, *op. cit.*, pp. 100-101.
60. Nicholas Mansergh (ed.), *The Transfer of Power*, Vol. II, pp. 982-983; also *The Indian Review*, 1942, p. 550.
61. *The Hindu*, 12 September 1942; also T.A. Raman, *Report on India*, p. 166.
62. G.O. No. S/325 A, Public Department, 25 February 1943, TNA.
63. Home, Pol., Department (Internal), Secret, File No. 3/58/42. NAI.
64. *Ibid.*
65. *Ibid.*
66. *Ibid.*
67. See Appendix. VII.
68. *The Hindu*, 20 August 1942.
69. *Ibid.*, also *The Indian Review*, 1942, p. 495.
70. *Ibid.*
71. *The Hindu*, 16 January 1943; 134 students were externed from the Benares district. These students belonged to different parts of India, like Delhi, Punjab, Bihar, Assam, Madras, and U.P., Home, Pol., File No. 22/47/44. Also see Arun Chandra Bhuyan, *The Quit India Movement*, pp. 84-87.
72. Govind Sahai, *op. cit.*, p. 247; also *Modern Review*, July 1942, p. 23.
73. *The Hindu*, 14 January 1943.
74. *Ibid.*, 26 January 1943.
75. See Government of India, *Congress Responsibility for the Disturbances 1942-43*; P.N. Chopra (ed.), *Quit India Movement.*
76. Horace Alexander, *India since Cripps*, p. 44.
77. Identical bits of leaflets "referring to the need for sabotaging public communications and suggesting that the British must be driven out" were circulated among students and labours. See Nicholas Mansergh (ed.), *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 724-725.
78. Translation of a cyclostyled Telugu pamphlet, released by the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, Bezwada, G.O. No. 2870, Public (Gl.), Confidential, Misc. Series, 15 September 1942, TNA; *Congress Responsibility for the Disturbances 1942-43*, pp. 55-56.
79. Press Note No. 184, Madras, 28 August 1942, *Ibid.*

80. *Close School and College*, Utkal Congress Bulletin, No. 3, Home, Pol. (Internal), 2 KW. 3/31/42/1942, NAI.
81. *Ibid.*
82. *Bravo Student Brothers*, Congress, *Ibid.*
83. *'Programme for Students'*, G.O. No. 11, Public Department (Gl.), (Confidential), 3 January 1944.
84. *Ibid.*
85. *Ibid.*
86. *Ibid.*
87. *The Hindu*, 14 August 1942.
88. *Ibid.*
89. *Ibid.*, 27 September 1942.
90. *Ibid.*
91. *Ibid.*, 17 October 1942.
92. *Fortnightly Reports*, 21 January 1941.
93. Letter of S.R. Kulkarni, under the assumed name S. Rangarao, 17 February 1943, Bombay, USS File, 2/1944, 13 January 1944, TNA.
94. Report on the Andhra Planning Committee meeting at Bezwada on 25 February 1943, *Ibid*
95. *Ibid.*
96. Secret, Confidential letter from the Special Branch, Criminal Investigation, to Chief Secretary, 27 April 1943, *Ibid.*
97. *"Why this Province lags behind"* – a Marathi document, dated 30 March 1943, *Ibid.*
98. Translation of a Manuscript, Telugu report on the condition in the Province, *Ibid.*
99. Secret letter from the Special Branch, Criminal, Investigation Department, to the Chief Secretary, dated 10 December 1943, *Ibid.*
100. P.M. Joshi, *op. cit.*, p. 67.
101. *The Hindu*, 13 August 1942.
102. *Ibid.*, 21 August 1942.
103. *Ibid.*, 14 September 1942.
104. *Ibid.*, 25 September 1942.
105. *Ibid.*, 2 October 1942.
106. See K.K. Abdul Rahman (ed.), *Kerala Congress Directory* (M), p. 100.
107. P.M. Joshi, *op. cit.*, p. 67.
108. *The Hindu*, 3 September 1942.
109. *Ibid.*, 13 September 1942.
110. *Ibid.*, 21 October 1942.
111. Later he was the Vice-Chancellor of Madras University.
112. *The Hindu*, 4 November 1942.

113. *Ibid.*
114. *Ibid.*, 25 February 1943.
115. *Ibid.*, 6 November 1942.
116. *Ibid.*, 4 November 1942.
117. *Ibid.*, 7 September 1942.
118. *Ibid.*
119. *Ibid.*
120. For the biographical data about the student martyrs see P.N. Chopra, *Who's Who of Indian Martyrs*, Vol. I and II.
121. Govind Sahai, *op. cit.*, p. 332.
122. *Ibid.*, p. 329; R.C. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 671; P.N. Chopra, "Quit India Movement of 1942", in the *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. XLIX, 1971, p. 41.
123. Jayaprakash Narayan, *Towards Struggle*, p. 20.
124. Allan and Wendy Scarfe, *J.P., His Biography*, p. 146.
125. A. Moin Zaidi, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
126. *Ibid.*
127. P.N. Chopra (ed.), *Quit India Movement*, pp. 189-192.
128. Amba Prasad, *op. cit.*, p. 77.
129. Pol. (Internal), File No. 3/52/43, NAI.
130. Interview with Prof. Bhagyanathan, former student activist.

Chapter 9

On the Eve of Independence

AFTER reaching the heights of revolution, the Quit India movement lost its momentum in spite of renewed attempts at its revival. Whereas Gandhiji suspended his first two civil disobedience movements when they turned violent, he was not at the helm of affairs to suspend the Quit India movement, when it too turned more violent than on previous occasions. Even though the violent phase of the movement disappeared after a short while, as a result of police suppression and various other pressures, it made the British rulers in India realise that India was no more willing to accept their regime. Though the British won the Second World War on the international arena and succeeded in suppressing the Indian revolution at home, for the first time they realised that they could no more carry on their rule over an unwilling India. This was the beginning of the last phase of British rule in India. This period began with the turn of 1942, and lasted till the achievement of independence. The realisation, on the part of the Congress that the liberation of India was round the corner, and on the part of the British that the time had come for the transfer of power, spelt change in the Indian political environment. Except on the occasion of the mutiny of the Royal Indian Navy which spread from Bombay to the other cities in 1946, the agitational movement of the nationalist leaders began to recede to the background, though the movement for Indian independence continued till the aim was attained. Much of the militancy of the movement was lost when the political parties turned to set up new patterns of political development. Agitation as a weapon to threaten the British Government began to lose its sharpness with their preparedness to transfer power. This change in the Indian political situation began to tell upon the student movement also. It marked the end of the value-oriented phase of the student movement as well as the beginning of the degeneration of the student movement in India.

With the conclusion of the Nagpur convention of the AISF, in December 1940, the parting of the ways of both the Communist and Congress factions began. The atmosphere of power politics, party rivalries and internal disruption, indicated the failure of the AISF to

rise to the occasion. Subsequent events, especially developments since 9 August 1942, completed the dismantling of the organization. Many organizations sprang up to fill the gap. Political activities in the wake of the Quit India movement delayed the formation of an alternative to the AISF. However, a change in the process began with the meeting of the Andhra Planning Committee convened at Bezwada on 25 February 1943. It was at this meeting that a decision was taken to start a network of the National Students' Organization with a programme of work extending to Andhra, Kerala and Tamil Nadu. The NSO was to carry out revolutionary propaganda among the student population. A provincial body of the NSO with Guntur as its headquarters was formed in Andhra. P.V.M. Bhimasankaram of Cocanada became its General Secretary. In Madras, the student participants in the 1942 rebellion were canvassing members for a National Students' Organization to counter the Communist-inspired Madras Students' Organization. However, a branch of it was opened there only on 29 July 1943. The organization soon became widespread with the opening of branches at Madras, Trichy, Vizagapatam, Nellore, Guntur, Bezwada, Calicut and other places.

Under the direction of known Congressmen, the open activities of the NSO became systematized. Rev. R.R. Keithan, an American missionary, was the guiding spirit of this movement. He presided over the first Andhra Provincial National Students' Conference at Guntur, which was held on 21 and 22 August. Himself an admirer of Gandhiji, he counselled the students to emulate Gandhiji and follow his methods. He organized a training camp for the members of the NSO in Mysore, in the following month. Student representatives from Andhra, Tamil Nadu and Kerala attended this camp. Again, at Madanapalle, in November 1943, Rev. R.R. Keithan urged students to form 'New India Cells' everywhere and to sanctify them to the Nation.[1]

The first South Indian National Students' Conference was held at Madras on 13 and 14 November 1943. In this great parliament of students, delegates from Bombay, Mysore, Andhra, Kerala and Tamil Nadu were participants.[2] Students from all institutions in the Madras city attended the conference in large numbers.

Ambadi Damodaran, the president of the Cochin Students' National Organization, after unfurling the flag,[3] brought to the notice of the audience the striking disparity between the preaching and practice of the British.[4] He questioned the attitude of the British Labour Party towards India, sympathising with the Indian struggle for freedom, on

the one hand, and stabbing the premier Indian national organization from behind, on the other. Alluding to the breach in the student movement, he felt sure that any spurious movement would disappear at the time when sincerity was put to the test. He wished that the NSO would take up the leadership in the task of exterminating fascism and establishing a new world order based on a nationalised economic theory.[5]

The inaugural address was delivered by G. Ramachandran of the Travancore State Congress, a man well aware of the pulse of the student movement. With characteristic eloquence he talked about the great things that were expected of the students in freeing India from the shackles of foreign domination. On seeing the delegates from Andhra, Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Mysore, participating in this conference, he called it a veritable South Indian Congress session of the youths. He claimed that "the Congress represents India. If one generation of Congressmen are kidnapped another generation will take up that place."[6] While saying this, he had in mind that the youngmen who were still abroad would take up the place of the older generation of the Congressmen who had been arrested.

He wished that the NSO should be an autonomous body which could come to its decisions from this background, unaffected by any external influences. However, he added that they would have to be fully aware of the national situations. They were to study them impartially and objectively not as party men, but as dispassionate critics. Such dispassionate study would reveal to them that a national struggle would not cease till the liberation of the country had been achieved. He did not want the students to get isolated from the major national current. He also exhorted them to build up their organization in such a way that every college should have its branch, a study group and a student service corps.

Presiding over the afternoon session of the conference, with an audience of about 200, Dinkar Sakrekar, attempted a cursory glance at the history of student movement in India. The student movement reached its watermark after the August rebellion when they demonstrated their role in the freedom movements as evidenced in their sacrifices and sufferings. Summing up the origin and progress of the student movement, he observed that though the All-India Students' Federation was a strong representative body of the students, "it had degenerated as an instrument of the Communist party. . . Out of the mistakes and past experiences, they found that the domination of one

party over the student movement ultimately led to disruption among their ranks. This was the genesis of the National Student Organization."[7] Then he attempted to identify the sort of political motive of the students. The students were not satisfied with the freedom in name or with the cheap academic rights. But "they wanted the democratization of their universities and educational institutions, set up by the foreign power. These institutions were not really free. They were being used for subtle propaganda; they had distorted their history. It was also used more for the purpose of dividing their ranks rather than for the object of imparting education."[8]

Then the conference discussed and passed a number of resolutions[9] which showed the content of the students' thought on matters political for the ensuing years. They adopted, by a resolution, the Students' Unity Manifesto in toto which was an appeal made to students by the Bombay Students' Unity Conference. The manifesto called upon the divergent student organizations to follow a truly nationalist line, and to become an integral part of the freedom struggle. Some of the resolutions passed, condemned Fascism and Nazism on the one hand and Imperialism on the other, demanded an impartial enquiry into the deplorable treatment given to the political prisoners, welcomed a united India in which all communities would enjoy rights and privileges of citizenship with safeguards for their religious and cultural freedom, and condemned the government for their contemplated abolition of prohibition, and the banning of the teaching of Bharathi songs in the schools.

The meeting also condemned the ban on meetings and processions conducted by the National Students' Organization in Andhra and the persecution of nationalist students in colleges, called upon the public to start national institutions to save the nationalist students from persecution, demanded the status of equality for Indian medicine with the other systems of medicine, requested the university and the governmental authorities to reduce the prices of educational accessories and revert to the system of "one examination a day." It was also resolved to start a journal of the NSO of India and to organize a National Volunteer Organization. Another resolution resolved that a provincial committee of 15 members drawn from Madras, Andhra, Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Karnataka, each represented by 3 members should be formed and that the General Secretary should be elected by the delegates. The quorum for the meetings of the Executive Committee was to be 5. The delegates were to choose and send up to the

General Secretary three names for each regional unit.

The adoption of the students' unity manifesto can be considered as a measure against reactionary and imperialistic elements. The resolution reaffirming faith in the national leadership of the country as represented by the Indian National Congress, was, though lauded as timely, opposed in the Subject Committee on the ground that the NSO should not be reduced to the status of a branch of the Indian National Congress. Ravindra Varma, of the Presidency College, Madras, while moving the resolution, referred to the Congress leadership which withstood the onslaught of national as well as international criticism. Bringing out the correct meaning of the 'fifth column', he maintained that the Communists, and not Congressmen, were the fifth columnists.

With the close of the proceedings of the conference, it was largely felt that the National Students' Organization had come into being when the AISF decided to identify itself with the Communist Party. The students of this National Organization were imbued with the spirit of freedom and the cause of the people. Though they observed that they should keep away from political parties, which used them as cats' paw, they identified themselves with the leadership of the National Congress and kept away from the Communists with their misleading notions on inter-communal unity, self-determination, people's war, etc.

The proceedings of this 'Parliament' especially in support of the August resolution, and the decision to start the Rashtra Seva Dal, bear close testimony to the alliance of the NSO with the Congress. The government felt menaced by this organization, through an official report of a Communist observer about the deliberations of this conference. The report said, "We will become great revolutionaries and issue a challenge to the British Government and we shall not rest till we drive them out... Congress have given us a call. It has been necessary to resort to a certain amount of destructive work. Our aim is construction through destruction."[10] The government further dug out another letter, one written by a woman member of the NSO to her parents at Vellore, dated 19 November 1943, in support of their argument. The relevant extract from that letter said, "A revolution, which is well-organized, can overthrow the Government, should occasion arise in the future... (it was agreed) to start an underground illegal organization which will have to oppose the Government when a crisis like the one we had in August last arose."[11] This mentality was behind the banning of the conferences in Guntur, Kistna and East Godavari districts, during November-December, 1943.

One important feature of activity in the Madras province since the August rebellion was the fight for control over the student population by the Communists and the Congress. In due course, it was proved that the Communist Party never wielded very strong influence over the student population of this presidency, and it seemed to be growing weak.[12] Students began to drift apart and the cleavage became wider as days passed. Whereas the Communist-controlled Madras Students' Organization made vain attempts for a rapprochement with the pro-Congress NSO, elsewhere they were at loggerheads.[13] Proceeding to the Communist Party's office at Guntur, some members of the National Students' Union attacked the Communists found there and burnt their flag.[14] Resolutions condemning the Communist Party's attempts to win over the Kisans from the N.G. Ranga group, were passed at a meeting of the National Youth Conference.[15] In Malabar, on 21 November, the pro-Congress members of the Grama Seva Sangh attacked the Communist students' gathering.[16]

The NSO had a membership of over 40,000 throughout south India and had branches even outside the province.[17] In the Telugu districts like Kistna, Guntur and Godavari, the NSO was very strong. Resolutions passed at the various conferences in the country were an evidence to show that the NSO had inherited the constructive programme of the Congress.[18] Attempts to advocate civil disobedience and to hold prohibition conferences in the four affected districts, and a provincial conference in the city, were also made by these organizations.[19] The government curtailed their activities by prohibitory orders, which culminated in the banning of the NSO itself.

The Government of Madras, by an order under section 16 of the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908, declared unlawful the NSO and its affiliated bodies. The notification issued by the government stated that the NSO was banned for its interference with law and order, thus constituting a danger to public peace.[20] The Government Order offered no explanation as to how the NSO had interfered in the law and order situation and constituted a danger to public peace. The government ban of the NSO found no justification for their action but for their intolerant determination to suppress everything that would "remotely add to the prestige or influence of the Congress among any section of the people."[21]

The Communists were also busy with national propaganda. They held two district conferences, one in West Godavari and the other in Guntur. P. Sundararama Reddy, a staunch Communist, presided over

these two well-attended conferences. In Godavari, he extolled the Russian regime and urged resistance to Japan. Speeches of the same tenor were made at Guntur. Again, he was the President of the Andhra Provincial Students' Conference which held its sessions from 12 to 14 November 1943. Their attempt to capture the NSO was foiled when the members of the National Youth League and other pro-Congress elements interrupted and caused disturbances by throwing stones, during the sessions.[22] The President was called a boot-licker of the government.[23]

Another important development of the period was the coming into the open of the Radical Democratic Party by starting a "Radical Students' Union."[24] This was started as a counterblast to both the Communists and the Congress. In a pamphlet condemning the Communists, they urged the students to join the radicals.[25] The poor response to the call marred the success of this students' union.

Though the government banned the Congress and drove its activities underground, the National Youth League and the NSO began to show manifestations of its resurrection. This was quite evident from the Nagpur convention of student workers, opposed to the AISF, from Madras, Bombay, Bengal and Central Provinces, on 29 and 30 April 1944. The gathering presided over by R. Achuthan of Palghat, reaffirmed its faith in the policy of the Indian National Congress and in the leadership of Gandhiji. The convention decided to form an "All India Students' Congress" with a common policy and programme. *Hind Praja*, published from Bombay and edited by Dinkar Sakrekar, was to be the chief organ, and Bombay its headquarters. A pamphlet entitled "Indian Students' Congress Explained" was widely circulated among students. This pamphlet mentioned the unity achieved by the Nagpur Convention based on three important factors: "(1) unity resulting out of homogeneity of political outlook, (2) organizational unity achieved by the voluntary merging of all varied elements into one common organization, (3) and lastly, the unity of action consequent upon the agreed programme."[26] Dinkar Sakrekar expressed confidence in this unity which strengthened the student movement in this country. It was also resolved to do the following organizational work: (a) to open branches of the "All India Students' Congress" at all important centres of education and to carry on intensive propaganda to attract students as soon as the schools and colleges were reopened; (b) to start a volunteer organization for training in drill and physical exercises, like the "Rashtra Seva Dal" of Bombay and C.P.; (c) to

organize the Kisans; (d) to raise funds to help the families of detenus and those convicted for participation in the Congress agitations; (e) to study the labour situation and assist the mill workers; (f) to organise small camps in the cities for training volunteers for work in the interior; and (g) to organise study circles where articles from the *Harijan* and books written by Jawaharlal Nehru and Gandhiji should be studied.[27]

With regard to the task of the ISC, the pamphlet, "The Indian Students' Congress Explained" said that it was to concentrate on training more active workers. Student organizations were to be made an inevitable counterpart of the educational system which was to be revolutionised.[28] It was also said that "wherever there is a school there must be a students' union also."[29] Organizations were to be decentralised and in order to meet the new objective needs which this organization had to fulfil, the organizational structure was required to be adopted. Again, to quote the pamphlet, "The programme of work chalked out at Nagpur is thus a broad outline of a picture, the details of which are to be filled by each unit according to the local situation."[30]

Soon after the Nagpur convention, branches were formed in Madras, Andhra and Malabar. Twelve students from Madras attended the Nagpur session. Of them, six were the leading members of the banned NSO.[31] At a meeting of student workers, held at the instance of K. Ramunni Menon, on 26 May 1944, a provisional committee for the city of Madras was set up with S. Appa Rao as its convenor. It was decided to launch a campaign to enrol members after the re-opening of the colleges. The office of the Madras branch of the ISC was functioning at 14/80, Pondy Bazar, Thyagaraya Nagar, Madras. In his capacity as the convenor, Appa Rao issued a statement on 31 May 1944, which referred to the Nagpur session and the decision evolved in it to organize the ISC to build up a militant student movement on progressive nationalistic lines, owing its allegiance to the Congress and Gandhiji.

On his return from Nagpur convention, Chivakula Venkateswaralu, Joint Secretary of the banned NSO, held a meeting of the Andhra Provincial Students' Congress workers at Bezwada on 3 May 1944. A branch of this organization was formed with its headquarters at Kanumuru, Kistna District. The gathering elected Kolli Ramakumara Varma of Kanumuru as organizer for the whole of Andhra and elected district organizers. K.P. Muhammed and R. Achuthan were the delegates from Malabar to attend the Nagpur meeting. Under the instructions of Achuthan, a meeting of the Congress-minded students was convened by the former on 24 April 1944 at Calicut. Then the

Malabar Students' Congress was formed with its headquarters at Calicut and with the following office-bearers: (1) V.M. Korath, Chairman, (2) K.P. Muhammed, General Secretary, (3) M. Rashid (Joint Secretary).[32]

The manifesto issued by the Madras Branch of the Indian Students' Congress was an attempt made by its leaders to link the thread of the student movement broken by the pro-imperialist policy preached by the leaders of the All-India Students' Federation. Students, young universalists as they were at heart, were socialists in creed. But the twists and turns given by the All-India Students' Federation, led by its wrong leadership since the historic declaration of 9 August and its open glorification of communalists like M.A. Jinnah, and slogans like "People's War" caused much discontent among the students. The failure of the AISF to realise the need of the hour worked against its own existence and caused new independent organizations to spring up. This was the result of the realization of the student mind to rise to the occasion and unify themselves to take their rightful place in the ranks of revolution. The need to "centralise these products of the revolution for a common policy and programme" became a necessity. Efforts towards that direction culminated in the historic convention at Nagpur, which decided to co-ordinate these units into the ISC, an All India Organization with a common policy and programme.

Whereas the ISC defined its ultimate aim to be the emancipation of the motherland, it considered the rebuilding of the student movement by creating an effective organization to strengthen the forces of revolution as its immediate task. The immediate programme of the ISC was to: (1) create an effective organization that really represented the student community by enrolling members and creating centres of activity; (2) carry out a planned constructive programme to establish contact with the rank and file of the students and to create in them the necessary consciousness through study-classes, camps and the like; (3) strengthen bonds of common nationality by promoting the national arts, culture, national language, etc.; (4) preserve the rights of the student community from all possible incursions, and (5) organize ameliorative measures even while realising that they could touch only the fringe of the problem.[33]

The Madras Branch of the Indian Students' Congress had no funds to begin with. Funds for those who attended the Nagpur Conference came from Messrs C.N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar, Venkataswamy Naidu and B. Gopala Reddy (Rs 50 each) and M.S. Appa Rao (Rs 200). Appa

Rao also met the initial expenses in connection with the printing of the membership forms, leaflets, etc.

The growth of the ISC was significant. By the end of August, the membership reached 2,500. By selling tickets mostly among students, prominent members of the organization could collect a fund of about Rs 5,000 for the Kasturba Gandhi Memorial Fund. Before the end of May 1945, it had over 18,000 members in its various branches, spread over 15 districts of the Madras Presidency.[34]

Under the auspices of the ISC a meeting to observe 'Tilak Day' was held on 1 August 1944 with N. Krishnaswami (ex-student, Pachaiyappa's College) in the chair. The chairman, before winding up the proceedings, criticised the MSO and claimed that the ISC believed in constructive programmes such as the ending of economic imperialism. Miss Senthamarakshi (Medical student) expressed the hope that the students under the leadership of the ISC would constitute a national unit among the students. Speeches in general reaffirmed faith in the Congress. This was followed by a government decision "to continue their ban on the holding of student camps for a period of another six months."

'Tagore Day' was observed by holding a meeting on 9 August 1944, with Mrs Ammu Swaminathan in the chair. K. Diraviyam, sub-editor of *Dinamani*, made a long speech on that occasion acclaiming the August resolution as being responsible for the political awakening of the country but at the same time affirming faith in Gandhi's leadership and his proposals for a communal agreement.[35]

The ISC also held a meeting on 15 August 1944 to celebrate 'Mahadéva Desai Day' with C.N. Muthuranga Mudaliar as the President. K. Ramunni Menon, N. Ali Ibrahim and Mrs Kuttimalu Amma spoke on that occasion. In the various meetings and conferences held, and in the statements issued on behalf of the ISC, they reaffirmed their belief in a constructive programme to achieve their object of ending the economic imperialism.

The leaders of the ISC were working under a constant threat of suppression by the government. So, they tried to avoid any direct confrontation with the government either through demonstrations or through public speeches. A meeting was held on 24 August 1944 to discuss the constitution of the Executive Committee, and the working policy to be adopted. The decision, taken at that meeting, that the office-bearers should not be participants in the previous political activities, goes to prove that they were keen on keeping on the right

side of the law. Their open allegiance to the leaders of the Congress and its policies, and the adoption of a pamphlet entitled "Indian Students' Congress Explained", published in the *Hind Praja* and circulated among students, created the impression that the ISC was only an attempt to revive the activities of the banned NSO.

The leaders of the ISC were conscious of the fact that this impression might make the government keep watchful eyes upon their activities. They, therefore, worked silently to carry on the programme decided upon by the Congress from time to time, by recruiting suitable members and training them to remain inconspicuous. Special study classes were conducted in secret to train such members for action. But their decision to start a Rashtra Seva Dal, on the model existing in Bombay and the Central Provinces, caused much apprehension in the minds of officials. The Dal was prominent in Kistna and South Kanara Districts.

The formation of District Congress committees, known as 'Congress Samitis' in Madras, Malabar, Godavari, Guntur, Kistna and Tanjore, was an effort of the Congressmen to carry out the items of Gandhiji's constructive programmes. Members of the Labour Congress, Kisan Congress and Students' Congress, were allowed to become members of the Congress Samitis. In Guntur, members of the Rangite Kisan Sabha were also included. This was also an attempt to oust the Communist elements from the Congress. In Madras city a 'Congress Sangam' was inaugurated by C.N. Muthuranga Mudaliar, on 21 October 1944.[36] An informal meeting of the Sangam was held on 12 November 1944, under the Presidency of Mrs Ammu Swaminathan. The meeting passed resolutions urging Congressmen to adhere to the August resolutions, to carry on the "constructive programme" and to form a volunteer corps on the lines of the Bombay Rashtra Seva Dal. "The appeal was reinforced by the suggestion that unless they do something to demonstrate the strength of the Congress, Mr Gandhi may be forced to undertake another fast which will lead to his death."[37]

Sub-committees were formed in places where 'Samitis' were already formed. Congressmen were busy working in various organizations such as those of kisans, students, etc., excluding the Communists and Socialists.

In order to stop the students from organizing volunteer corps and holding training camps for them, the government issued a "certificate under the Camps and Parades Control order in respect of the Students' Congress." As per the orders, prior permission to hold training camps had to be obtained from the District Magistrate or the Commissioner

of Police.[38] In some districts, students defied prohibitory orders whereas in others they went about selling miniature Congress flags. Attendance was poor in some educational institutions in the city. The students of the Tambaram Christian College went in a procession inside the campus. They were shouting slogans and were carrying the Congress flag. Some of them also observed fast. Similar demonstrations took place in Madanapalle also. In spite of the prohibitory orders, some students in Nellore attempted to hoist the Congress flag in front of the college. They gave up the plan when five of them were arrested (and were later released).[39]

Enmity towards the Communists did not stop with the act of dissociating from them. Clashes of interests were taken to the discussion table at the District Congress Samitis, where the necessity of excluding Communists, and the possible ways of combating the increasing Communist influence, were discussed. The same trend was observed in the students' associations, too. At a conference organized by the Students' Congress at Chittoor, "the importance of carrying out Gandhiji's constructive programme was stressed as the only way to destroy British imperialism."[40] The Communist students tried to combat this in many ways. The fourth annual conference of the Communist-controlled MSO held at Madras, showed that retaliatory spirit. Speeches on both the occasions were mainly related to "the formation of a National Government, release of the Congress leaders and the need for a Congress-League settlement."[41] To meet the expenses of sending medical relief delegates to Malabar and North Vizagapatam, they issued an appeal in April for contributions of money and medicine.[42]

Soon, the 'constructive programme' was relegated to the background and the students were preoccupied with the propaganda for recruitment to a "Citizenship College" to be opened in Bombay early in May. The Kerala Students' Congress proposed to depute five delegates to be trained there. In various places training camps were opened and funds were collected for the purpose. At Guntur a training camp was opened on 14 July 1945. The District Congress Assembly in Kistna decided to appoint paid organizers in each town and taluk for enrolling members and absorbing the kisan and youth movements into the Congress.[43]

With the reopening of colleges and schools, signs of increased activity were seen among the workers of the ISC. They were busy collecting funds to be presented to Jawaharlal Nehru on his birthday (14 November 1945), and for the Kamla Nehru Hospital. In the Andhra

districts, a programme to enrol 30,000 members was launched. In the first half of September 1945, Ravindra Varma, Vice-President of the AISC, conducted a tour in some of the Andhra districts. He appealed to the students to support the Congress, and criticised the Communist Students' Federation.[44]

The clash between the Communists and the Congress was a peculiar feature of this period. In Kistna, commotion was created at a meeting of the Andhra Provincial Students' Conference, when some Congress leaders spoke about the necessity of excluding the Communists. One of the topics discussed at a meeting of the District Congress Committee of Madura was the increasing Communist influence over the Madura labour wing and the possible ways of combating it.[45]

The students of the Madras Presidency were in the forefront of the agitation against the trial of the INA heroes. In honour of the leaders of the INA, they held meetings and hartals in the various parts of the Presidency. Such processions and meetings were prohibited by government orders. Strikes were organized in the major centres of the Presidency. At a students' meeting in Guntur held on 12 November 1945 one speaker said, "In Bengal wall posters have been put up threatening to murder 20 whitemen for every INA man executed by the Government."[46]

Students of many schools and colleges observed hartal in the Madras province. In Madura, a number of students abstained from classes and went in procession touching various schools, on 6 November 1945. The processionists chased traffic constables, burnt traffic umbrellas and heavily stoned a police party which arrived on the scene. In the firing which followed, one person was killed on the spot, another died at the hospital, and many were injured. The crowd was dispersed with the use of teargas. Police excesses in Calcutta, Bombay and Madura were strongly condemned at a number of gatherings.

The mutiny of the Royal Indian Navy started in Bombay in February 1946. Student disturbances broke out in Bombay and Calcutta to protest against the sentence imposed on Capt. Abdul Rashid of the INA. The students of the Madras Presidency, too, held demonstrations against the police action in Bombay and Calcutta, and against the sentence on Capt. Rashid. Students from the various colleges in the Madras city held a meeting on 14 February 1946, under the Presidency of C. Veeraraghavan, and demanded the unconditional release of Capt. Rashid and other political prisoners.[47]

This period also saw the visit of national leaders to the various

centres of the Presidency, in connection with one function or the other. Acharya Kripalani, Dr Varadarajulu Naidu, Allapichai Sahib, Kamala Devi Arya, Asoka Mehta and Mrs Aruna Asaf Ali were some of them. They exhorted the students to get ready for "direct action" by forming a united front of labour, kisans and members of the ISC and the Rashtra Seva Dal, with a large number of ex-INA personnel in the country.

An attempt was afoot in the Madras city in the first half of September 1945, to "co-ordinate the activities of various youth organizations in the city and to concert measures for organizing a new central organization."[48] This fructified when a National Youth Federation, co-ordinating several youth organizations, was inaugurated by K. Kamaraja Nadar. Its object was to carry out the constructive programme and work for the removal of communal differences.[49]

The two main volunteer bodies in the Madras Presidency were the RSS and the Muslim National Guard. With its headquarters at Nagpur, the militant Hindu RSS had managed to gain a foothold in the Madras Presidency, where it was controlled by the Hindu Mahasabha. Although the RSS attracted several students to its programmes, it had no student wing as such. But later, it became active among the students and made efforts to train them in physical culture.[50] With this object in view, they organised a summer class in Madras city from 10 May 1947 for its student members from Andhra and Tamilnadu. 700 students participated in the training course.[51] The curriculum included "physical exercises, training in the art of attack and self-defence, and lectures on Hindu ideals and precepts."[52] This principal organization of the Hindu right wing was strong in the Madras city and in Kistna, West Godavari and Nellore districts. Their strength in Godavari was as many as 1,200.[53] They usually carried sticks, upto five feet long, but they constituted no threat to public peace.[54] The Muslim National Guard was not very active in this Presidency. They unfavourably viewed the summer school held by the RSS, as a threat to Hindu-Muslim cordiality. They, too, carried with them sticks, and sometimes, wooden swords.[55] The other volunteer organizations were Azad Hind Fauz and the Rashtra Seva Dal. The Fauz started a training school in Nellore district, where the volunteers were trained in road marches, and drill.[56] However, the Fauz failed to attract volunteers to it.

The attempt of the nationalist students in the AISF, to identify themselves with the Congress ideology, resulted in a welter of student conferences throughout India. Their effort to reorganise themselves fructified with the conclusion of the AISF session which met in Bombay

by the end of 1944 with Humayun Kabir as the President. The AISF was meeting for the first time after the Nagpur split. Four hundred delegates, representing a total membership of over a lakh and a half from all over India, attended the conference.[57] The conference came out with an important decision on the new year day in 1945, to rename the AISF as the "All India Students' Congress." The conference considered the choice of the students to be "between militant nationalism and nebulous internationalism, between Indian patriotism and Russian patriotism, between grim preparation for a struggle and an inaction glorified by cheap heroics."[58]

By the time the AISC held its December 1946 session at Delhi, India had reached the threshold of independence. Various influences were at work to effect a change in the tactics and programmes of the student movement. A serious question they posed was about the future role of the students in Indian politics. Much of the discussion was centred on the change from a militant programme for national independence to that of the student organization concerned with campus matters. But opinions differed as to the quantum of politics they could have in their activities. The conservative Congress leaders favoured their going back to their studies. Gandhian students thought of bringing together all the students under a single banner, irrespective of their factions, with less politics in the programme. The Communists, on the other hand, believed in keeping their hold on students so that they could build up a strong base for their party. In this context students were called upon to choose their way. The AISC session of 1946 came forward with a programme which included study classes, literacy campaigns (for Hindustani), aids to students in day to day problems, village improvement work, propaganda for communal harmony, volunteer corps, citizenship classes, research centres, etc. When the 1946 session of the AISC stripped off its political role and adopted a campus-oriented programme, the 1947 session gave it the official recognition. The President of the session viewed that the change in the AISC programme was much in the interests of its own survival.[59] At this juncture, it will be apt to recall the remark of Gandhiji: "Power politics should be unknown to the student world. Immediately (when) they dabble in that class of work, there ceases to be a students' will, (and) therefore they fail to serve the country in its time of crisis."[60]

Again, he said to Ravindra Varma, who interviewed him on 7 August 1947, "There is no doubt that there should be one national organization including the Hindus, the Muslims and others. Students are the makers

of the future. They cannot be partitioned. I am sorry to observe that neither the students have thought for themselves nor have the leaders left them to their studies so that they can become good citizens. The rot began with the alien Government. We, the inheritors, have not taken the trouble to rectify the errors of the past. Then the different political groups have sought to catch the students as if they were shoals of fish. And stupidly the students have run into the net spread for them.

It is therefore a Herculean task for any student organization to undertake. But, there must be the heroic spirit among them who would not shrink from the task. The scope will be to knot them together into one. This they cannot do unless they will learn to steer clear of active politics. A student's duty is to study the various problems that require solution. His time for action comes after he finishes his studies. They must eschew politics. It is sign of one-sided growth that all parties have made use of the student world for their purpose. This was probably inevitable when the purpose of education was to create a race of slaves who would hug their slavery. That part of the business is over."[61]

Much water had flowed beneath the bridge since this thought was expressed. But, the Students' Congress and other major student organizations failed to shift "their efforts from an emphasis on political struggle to a programme of Gandhian constructive service."[62] In the pre-Independence days the students held aloft the expulsion of the British out of India as their political aim; if the nationalist leaders had upheld that, with the departure of the British many of the social evils would also have been removed. The nationalist leaders, engaged in this political mission, invited as well as incited students to play a large part in the political agitation. But when the British departed from India they left behind many of the causes of the general unrest, unremedied. Thus they bequeathed the seeds of 'student indiscipline' which has become an evil phenomenon in the post-Independence days in India.

Notes and References

1. G.O. No. 1/1944, USS File, Secret, 13 January 1944, TNA.
2. Some of the important delegates who had taken part in the deliberations were: G. Ramachandran of Travancore; Dinkar Sakrekar, Editor, *Hindu Praja*, Bombay; Mrs Krishnabai Nimbkar; K. Subramaniam, formerly Prof. of Loyola College; P.M. Joshi, N.S.O., Bombay; T. Thomas, Stanley Medical College; T.S. Pattabhiraman, M.A., B.L., Advocate, Madras; Ramunni Menon, Ex-student, Christian College; T.V. Nambiar; C. Sivaraman of Calicut (Zamorin

College); Achutha Menon (Calicut); Ambadi Damodaran (Cochin); Bagianathan (Cochin); A.S. Sadasivan, Secretary, N.S.O.; Subharaman of Pachaiyappa's College; S.K. Chinnathambi, Secretary, N.S.O., Madurai; Hamid, Madras; Bheem Sankara Rao, Andhra, (Guntur, A.C. College); Venkiteswaran, Andhra; Subharama Reddi, Vasudeva Rao, Mysore; Kannappa, Ramlinga Raju, Madurai; Ranga Raju, Tamil Nadu. *Source: Ibid.*

3. The Students' Flag that was unfurled had a white background red borders with the following words in red letters "Freedom, Peace and Progress". It was otherwise called "The Freedom Flag".
4. Report on the first South Indian National Students' Conference, G.O. No. 1/1944, USS File, Secret, 13 January 1944, TNA.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Free Press*, 14 November 1943.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*
9. For the details of the resolution passed see G.O. No. 1/1944, USS File, Secret, 13 January 1944, TNA.
10. Home, Pol. (Internal), F. 92/44, NAI.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Fortnightly Reports*, 10 September 1943.
13. *Ibid.*, 12 October 1943.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*, 23 October 1943.
16. *Ibid.*, 9 November 1943.
17. *Indian Express*, 21 January 1944.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Fortnightly Reports*, 21 December 1943.
20. G.O. No. 136, Public Department, 13 January 1944, TNA.
21. *Indian Express*, 21 January 1944.
22. *Fortnightly Reports*, 24 November 1943.
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Ibid.*
26. *The Students' Congress Explained*, issued by the Madras Branch of the Indian Students' Congress, TNA.
27. Letter from the special branch, Criminal Investigation Department to the Chief Secretary, 26 June 1944; USS File, 132/44, 15 November 1944, TNA.
28. *Indian Students' Congress Explained.*
29. *Ibid.*
30. *Ibid.*
31. They were M.S. Appa Rao, K. Ramunni Menon, G. Rajagopalan, N. Krishnaswamy, T. Thomas, and G. Ravindra Varma.

32. Confidential letter from the special branch CID, 17 August 1944, USS File, 132/44, 15 November 1944, TNA.
33. *Indian Students' Congress, Manifesto*, TNA.
34. *Statement*

District	*Strength*	
Madras	1,500	
Anantapur	238	
Chittoor	150	
West Godavari	300	
Guntur	2,500	(10 branches)
South Kanara	10	(2 branches)
Kistna	7,000	
Madura North	700	
Malabar	3,119	(17 branches)
Nellore	600	
Tanjore	165	
Tirunnevelly	15	
Trichinopoly	170	
Vizagapatam	756	(5 branches)
Total	18,293	

Remarks: Membership campaign was going on in 7 places in Chittoor district. at the end of which the total of members was likely to be 1950.

Source: Confidential letter from Special Branch CID, 12 June 1945, USS File, 132/44, 15 November 1944, TNA.

35. *Fortnightly Reports*, 25 August 1944.
36. *Ibid.*, 6 November 1944.
37. *Ibid.*, 17 November 1944.
38. *Ibid.*
39. *Ibid.*, 7 February 1945.
40. *Ibid.*, 25 January 1945.
41. *Ibid.*
42. *Ibid.*, 4 August 1945.
43. *Ibid.*
44. *Ibid.*, 26 September 1945.
45. *Ibid.*, 22 February 1945.
46. *Ibid.*, 12 November 1945.
47. Mitra (ed.), *op. cit.*, Vol. I, 1946, p. 278.
48. *Fortnightly Reports*, 26 September 1945.
49. *Ibid.*, 25 October 1945.
50. For a brief sketch of the growth of the Hindu Youth Movement in Hindustan see Indra Prakash, *A Review of the History and Work of the Hindu Mahasabha*

and the Hindu Sanghatan Movement, pp. 401–406; also see Joseph Curran, *Militant Hinduism in Indian Politics: The Case of the RSS*.

51. *Fortnightly Reports*, 24 June 1947.
52. *Ibid.*
53. *Ibid.*, 17 July 1947.
54. *Ibid.*
55. *Ibid.*
56. *Ibid.*
57. *Forum*, Indian Weekly News Magazine, Vol. 3, 7 January 1945, No. 21.
58. *Ibid.*
59. Ravindra Varma, *Whither the Student Movement*, p. 40.
60. K. Diraviyam, "Whither the Student Movement" in *Sathi*, 1 June 1946.
61. Ravindra Varma, *op. cit.*, pp. 1–2.
62. Amrik Singh and Philip G. Althach, *The Higher Learning in India*, p. 147.

Chapter 10

Conclusion

WITH the advent of the British, India began to enjoy the advantages of the modern system of education. Missionaries were the pioneers in this field. India offered them vast scope for the spread of their religion. The British Government in India thought of the prospects of cheap recruits to run the administration. This is obvious from the changing trends effected in the educational policy by the British. The first generation of westerm-educated students were enlightened in the real sense of the term. They supplied the intellectual background for Indian nationalism. But enlightening the masses was not the real purpose of the English education in India. They wanted to dominate India and control its affairs. This constrained them to change their educational policies from time to time. A few notable features of the changes were the total negligence of the indigenous system of education, and the high place given to the English language with priority for literary studies and little preference for science, technology, etc. Preference for English education at the expense of the Indian languages did more harm than good. The ill-conceived system of teaching English in the educational institutions was, to the students, a burden rather than a road to enlightenment. This led to the 'massacre of the innocents' in the educational institutions. Another important feature was the lower rate given to education in the budget, resulting in the decadence of the educational system much against its increasing importance. With the passing of years, educated as well as half-educated youths began to swell the rank of the unemployed.

The decadence of the educational system ignited the growing interest of students in politics. The government sensed danger in the exuberance of their political consciousness. Instead of appreciating their feelings they branded them as seditionists and began to chalk out repressive measures in order to safeguard the interests of the government. The increase in such measures estranged the student community from the government. Politicians stepped in where the colonial government hesitated to play their role. They channelled the grievances of the student community and helped them to rise to the position of a historic

opposition to the government. With the passage of time the student community began to realise their political potentialities. This, above all, urged them to play a vital role in the freedom movement of the country.

Bengal stole the lead from the other parts of India in launching an agitational campaign against the British. It was occasioned by the partition of Bengal in 1905. Reaction against this move was at first very mild. But gradually the political climate thickened and burst out in Bengal and elsewhere. Boycott of the foreign educational system was advocated in Bengal. Attempts were made to establish national educational institutions with indigenous educational system. This caught the imagination of the students who came forward to take up the agitation, to new frontiers. Though the elders held the stewardship of the agitation it was the young blood that kept up the enthusiasm throughout the agitation. Their enthusiasm attained new heights when they were confronted with government circulars curtailing their political activities. While many students returned to educational institutions when normalcy returned, some students were permanently recruited to politics and some others took to revolutionary methods and either got rusted behind the bars or achieved martyrdom. The partition of Bengal would have remained a regional issue but for the impetus given by the enlightened Bengal. India awoke by that time to the deep political game the British in India were playing.

In the Madras Presidency, the newspapers broadcasted the progress of the Swadeshi movement of Bengal. Student population in the Madras Presidency had many occasions to study and discuss public questions of the day in many of their debating societies and literary associations. Some were held under the patronage of lawyers, while others were held under the direct supervision of the educational authorities. By reading the new media they had already manifested political consciousness. The Swadeshi movement in Bengal had its distinct echo among the students of Madras, largely in the form of anti-British feelings and outbursts of patriotic fervour. 'Bande Mataram,' which literally meant 'Salute the Mother', became their war-cry. But that same harmless word was anathema to the Europeans to whom it appeared to be seditious.

This was the beginning of the parting of the ways. The educational authorities tried to contain the students with the help of circulars, whereas the students, urged by the patriotic call of the national leaders, began their political career. The attempt of the British authorities to

suppress the inborn urge of the students failed, when a new wave of interest was ushered in with the visit in Madras of Bipin Chandra Pal, the Bengali agitator, in April-May, 1907. His lectures during this period reverberated with the gospel of Swadeshi as obtained in Bengal. Elders as well as youngsters flocked to listen to his lectures. The student community, for the first time, were swept off their feet by his lectures. The Tinnevelly riots, the student agitations at Cocanada and Rajahmundry, and the sedition cases against G. Subramonia Iyer, V.O. Chidambaram Pillai and Subramonia Siva, were some of the sparks of the Swadeshi movement in the Madras Presidency. The government deprecated these activities, and in their attempt to suppress the movement, drove the forces of revolution underground. The revol-utionaries held a direct link with the Indian revolutionaries like V.D. Savarkar and his lieutenant V.V.S. Aiyar, with bases in London, Paris and Pondicherry. They planned an armed uprising whereby they believed they could liberate the country. The service of Neelakanta Brahmachari and Vanchi Iyer, two youths in this episode of terrorism, loomad large. Terrorism in south India started with a bang when Ashe, the District Collector of Tinnevelly was murdered, but it ended in a whimper when it fizzled out in the judicial case that followed.

Much of the work done by the extremists was undone when they came out of their prison. The government through piecemeal reforms tried to calm down the situation. Tilak in Maharashtra, and Mrs Annie Besant in the Madras Presidency, tried to pull the national movement from the extremist track and put it on that of the moderates. Before entering the arena of politics, Mrs Besant had the halo of a theosophist, philanthropist and educationist. This made many from Madras look upon her as 'Annai' (Mother), and no doubt she was able to captivate their minds, especially those of the youngsters. At one time she said that it was for drifting the youngsters from the evil influence of the anarchists that she had plunged into politics. Her methods and manners on the platform as well as in the press greatly influenced the student community. On the eve of the First World War, she called upon Indians to force the British to grant constitutional reforms. In order to achieve these aims she launched the Home Rule Movement. This infuriated the British who imprisoned her. The incarceration brought her popularity, which gave her an easy way to ascend the Presidential *gaddi* of the Indian National Congress.

Amidst her larger political activities, she kept constant touch with the student world to keep them away from anarchism and to train them

up for citizenship. With this idea in mind she started the Orders of the Sons and Daughters of India, the Order of the Rising Star, and the Indian Boys Scouts Association. Her efforts to inculcate the spirit of patriotism in the minds of the students found their full expression with the starting of the national education movement. Aware of the defects of the western education imparted in India, she concentrated more on removing the deficiencies of such an education. In that attempt, she made wider opportunities for the Indian students to know about India and her problems and feel proud of being Indians, and to work for solving its problems after the completion of their studies. The students, by that time, were conscious about themselves and their surroundings, as was evident from the fact that they had begun to meet in innumerable conventions. Following the pattern set by the Bihari Students' Convention, the Madras Students' Convention was brought into being in 1916. The proceedings of the session imitated those of the sessions of the Indian National Congress. Most of the topics discussed were concerned with matters of educational and contemporary importance. The proceedings of these sessions found an honourable place in the columns of *New India*, the mouthpiece of Annie Besant's cause. These conventions not only ventilated their grievances but also served as a springboard for the student comunity for wider ventures.

The British did not restrict their students from participating in the politics of their country. Perhaps the British students had to assume political responsibilities at an early date, since they had a vast empire bequeathed unto them, to look after. But the position of the Indian students was quite different. They belonged to a subject country. Hence the imperialist rulers held that they were not to dabble in politics. But the increasing political awakening among students caused much anxiety among the authorities. The Indian students were well read in western literature and were well aware of what democracy and revolution meant. So it would be a futile attempt to hold them back. The British educational system aimed at slowing down the pace of achieving this aspiration or preventing them altogether from aspiring for it. They also set about the impossible task of raising a fortification around the students to prevent them from indulging in politics. Government issued order after order assigning power to the educational authorities to penalize those young intellectuals dabbling in politics. This was much against the interests of the academicians, as well as those of the students. Many resolutions, passed in their protest meetings, expressed this dislike. But the government stood adamant

and did nothing to correct them in the nick of time. No wonder, policies became a forbidden fruit in effect, which, by the peculiar nature of the students, was much sought after.

Incarceration in an Indian jail was not to the liking of Mrs Besant. So when the Montagu-Chelmsford proposals were offered, she decided to work for the reforms. This political change on Mrs Besant's side made her unpopular among the younger section of the Indian nationalists. Soon, Mrs Besant, with her political mission, which was the setting up of an Indo-British Commonwealth leading to a world commonwealth, was relegated to the background. By 1920, elderly politicians like Gokhale, Tilak and Pherozeshah Mehta had passed away leaving the leadership of the national movement to Mahatma Gandhi who had appeared on the Indian political scene. He declared that the attainment of Swaraj was to be the political ideal, and non-cooperation with the government, the method to obtain it. Once the objective was defined, it was left to Gandhiji to carry the Congress and the nation with him. He effected structural changes in the Congress organisation and made an all-India tour to convince the people of his programme. The Nagpur Congress of December 1920 resolved to work for the attainment of self-government outside the British empire. Boycott of educational institutions and the establishment of national educational institutions were among the programmes chalked out by the Congress under the leadership of Gandhiji. If successfully carried out, they would have paralysed the government. But it was destined to be otherwise. In Bengal and the Punjab, the student community readily responded to the call. In Madras, Gandhiji's leadership was weak at the beginning. But he soon convinced the people, especially the younger generation, through his lecture tour and thus carved out a following. Student community in Madras was spell-bound by Mrs Besant. Gandhiji had to release the students off this fold before he could obtain their cooperation. Students, attracted by his speech and his magnetic personality, were soon to follow him in large numbers. So far, the students were held back from taking part in active politics. But in response to the appeal made to them by Gandhiji to vacate the educational institutions and to do social service, for a year, for the attainment of Swaraj within that period, the student community all over India flocked out of the educational institutions. Students were chiefly employed in volunteer services. They took the Congress propaganda to the villages, thus evolving a mass base for the Congress.

Though the boycott of educational institutions was effective, it had

to bear the brunt of criticism. Gandhiji expected the attainment of Swaraj within one year. But he had to withdraw his movement prematurely. Students who left the educational institutions had to return to their *alma maters* since accommodating them in a few national schools was a Herculean task. The movement, on the other hand, could open the eyes of the government to the ill-fated educational systems. As the Congress realised its limitations and the government recognised its faults, the students' role in active politics was justified, which has become a phenomenon in Indian policies since then.

The failure of the non-cooperation movement cleared the way for the constitutionalists to go ahead with their legislative experiments. But constitutionalists, too, failed to gain much ground. Frustration among the nationalists became obvious when the all-white Simon Commission came to India in 1927 to review the working of the reforms of 1919. The Commission was greeted with black flags all over India. This unrest in the minds of the Congressmen was reflected when they passed a resolution for complete independence at the Madras Congress held in 1927. The resolution came from Jawahalal Nehru, a leader of the younger generation. This was against the Motilal Nehru Report, which favoured dominion status for India. The controversy between the two generations brought Gandhiji as a mediator. He suggested that if India was not accorded dominion status within a year, a civil disobedience programme would be launched in order to win complete independence for India.

The Congress in December 1929 resolved to go ahead with the Civil Disobedience Movement, since the Viceroy, Lord Irwin, slept over the Calcutta ultimatum. Gandhiji offered an eleven-point proposal to Lord Irwin, which included the abolition of salt taxes. In the event of this demand being rejected, he would march to Dandi to break the salt law. Lord Irwin ignored the ultimatum and the march to Dandi was held as scheduled. Dandhi was re-enacted throughout India. Gandhiji's call to the students was to precipitate the Civil Disobedience Movement. Apart from volunteer work, students actively participated in hartals, picketing and boycott programmes. The Gandhi-Irwin Pact, which temporarily suspended the movement, ignored the students at the time of settlement. Students from institutions, which till then had not involved in active politics, had a significant role in the movement. The experience thus gained helped the student-body to become a fighting force with a large share in the fights yet to come.

The students' role in the liberation as well as the regeneration of the

country was much emphasised after the subsidence of the Civil Disobedience Movement. While the Congress helped to bring about a trained volunteer corps among the students, they also tried to help the consolidation of all student movements. This long-cherished dream became a reality when the First All-India Students' Conference was convened at Lucknow on 19 August 1936. This organization aimed at rousing political, social and economic consciousness among students and leading them to the struggle for complete independence. Though the AISF held all the political groups in its fold, it failed to protect itself from the signs of disruption posed by national as well as international issues.

The formation of an All-India Muslim Students' Federation in 1937, and the desire of the Communist elements in the student community to capture the AISF, manifested this tendency of disruption. The AIMSF was formed in response to the call of M.A. Jinnah, who clamoured for the creation of Pakistan. The rift between the Congress-minded students and the Communist elements in the AISF manifested itself in its third session held at Madras, when a resolution praising the newly inaugurated Soviet constitution was put to vote. The discussion led to a furore, which ended in the virtual split of the organization. After several months, their differences were patched up and unity was maintained till 1940, when it finally split up into two factions, at the Nagpur session of the Federation.

At a time when the Congress Party was assessing the developments in the wake of World War II , the Communist Party was professing an anti-British, anti-war, pro-Hitler policy. In the place of Gandhiji's technique they advocated a national revolution. In fact, these controversies were reflected in the VI session of the AISF, finally leading to a division between the contending sections. The violation of the Russo-German non-agression pact by Germany, necessitated a realignment of forces in international politics. Russia joined the British war-camp and fought against Germany. This change in the Russian foreign policy forced the CPI to take back all they had professed to do in national politics. Coupled with this, the advent of the Japanese army in South-East Asia, the loss of Indian confidence in the British with the government's failure to check the ebb-tide in the war-torn economy, spread of cholera and poverty, and the failure of the Cripps' proposals, forced a reversal of roles in Indian politics. Finally, when the "National Call" came from the Congress, the CPI developed a "People's war" theory and supported the British in the war efforts. The confusion prevailing in the national scene was much

reflected in the AISF session held on 31 December 1941 at Patna. Since the leaders of the Communist group in the AISF were members of the CPI, it was no wonder that they adopted the 'people's war' theory and decided to suspend the national struggle for freedom. But the Communist hold over the AISF was lost in the wake of the Quit India movement launched by the Congress on 9 August 1942 and as a result of the policy of suppression maintained by the government. The student community once again proved that they were a party to the national revolution and that they were against the government.

The extent and magnitude of the Quit India movement, unlike those of the previous movements, have puzzled the historians to draw a true picture of its nature. At a time when Britain was entangled in World War II she wanted India as an ally in the fight and seriously viewed any upheaval in the internal politics of India. They thought that they could bamboozle India by pressure rather than by persuasion. Gandhiji's decision to launch the Quit India movement was the final step that he took after giving enough time for the British to study the Indian demands and move accordingly. The AICC approved the Quit India movement proposal and the entire nation was set agog waiting for the announcement of the programme by Gandhiji. But the British thought that they could defeat the movement by rounding up its sponsors. Their calculation proved wrong. The nation came to grief by this measure and it expressed this at first in a non-violent manner, but violence erupted with the unleashing of suppression eveywhere. The British, though they succeeded in arresting the sponsors, failed to check the spread of the latter's ideas, which found wide acclaim in the country, in the shape of circulars, pamphlets, instructions, etc., which incited the rank and file of the freedom fighters to lead themselves and fight for freedom by themselves. Gandhiji's message, 'do or die' gave spurt to their activities. Gandhiji exhorted the student community to fight to a finish. The students, rebellious as they are by nature, were soon to play a major role in this great struggle. They took the leadership of the movement and maintained their contact with the Congress leaders who escaped from arrest and went underground. They took the programmes of the movement to the villages and organized the peasants as well as the labourers. This combination ravaged the power points of the British and dampened their spirit to a large extent.

The students stoically suffered the police excesses. Many were jailed or killed in indiscriminate firing. The large scale destruction they caused during the course of the movement was disowned by the

government, which accused the Congress as the mischief makers. When the World War came to a close, they began to think seriously of the necessity of granting freedom to the nation. This was a recognition of the fact that the British had finally realised that they could hold the Indian empire no more. They began to take steps for the transfer of power.

The students could find no time to re-organize their ranks during the hectic days of the Quit India movement. But, with the slowing down of the movement, the process to find out an alternative to the dismantled AISF began to take shape. The Congress as well as the Communists exercised all their influence, to carry the student population with them. The Congress could get an easy access to, and maintain contact with, the students. The efforts of the Congress-minded students to identify themselves with the Congress, resulted in the formation of a number of student conferences throughout India. The National Students' Organization, with its activities extended to Andhra, Kerala and Tamil Nadu, was the pioneer among them. The NSO showed manifestations of its wide influence, from the beginning. The Government of Madras banned the activities of the NSO and the pro-Congress National Youth League, but the activities soon resurrected when the decision to form an All India Students' Congress was taken in the Nagpur Convention of the students. Though the Students' Congress recorded significant growth, its leaders were under constant threat of suppression by the authorities. This made its leaders vigilant and moderate in their activities. The AISC opted to soft-pedal their political activities and to remain isolated from party politics. When the glow of independence showed itself in the Indian horizon the young intellectuals were relegated to the background. Students who were much sought after by the politicians during the drooping years of the British power were subjected to a state of salutary neglect. Politicians who were much concerned with the new responsibilities and changed roles began to think in terms of power politics. They expected the students now to have less politics and more ethics, and return to their studies as a disciplined lot. It would have been a sagacious step more realistic in solving the problem of student indiscipline in free India if they had removed the roots of their unrest by entrusting to them a small share in the administration. But the student community was forced to assume a new role in post-independence India, making its presence deeply felt in Indian politics by opposing the authorities wherever possible and whenever necessary. They are now a soi-disant, unofficial, permanent opposition group, in Indian politics.

Chronology of Student Organizations

1886	Students' Literary Association formed.
1902	Northern Circar Students' Conference.
1903	Young Men's Hindu Association – Salem.
1905	Swadeshi Movement, debut of students in National Politics.
	Nellore Progressive Union.
1907	Young Men's Association at Dindigul, Madurai.
	Bala Bharath Samithi in Rajahmundry.
	Swadesha Vastu Pracharini Sabha.
1900–1915	Ganjam District Students' Conference.
	Chittoor-North Arcot Students' Conference.
	All-Orissa Students' Conference.
	Young Utkal Association.
	Malabar Students' Conference.
	Tinnevelly Students' Association.
	Nellore District Conference.
1915	Home Rule Leagues Started.
	Andhra Students' Conference.
1916	Madras Students' Conventions.
1917	League of Youth (Madras).
1920	Gandhiji launches Non-cooperation movement.
	All India College Students Conference held in Nagpur.
	National Volunteer Corps (Congress).
	National Corps – Hindu Oriented.
	Ramadandu – Hindu Oriented (Northern Circars).
	Khilafat Corps (Islamic Colleges, Vaniyambadi).
	The Servants of Islam (Corps of Muhammadan Volunteers).
	Gandhiji visits Madras (August).
1921	Telugu Santi Sena (Peace Army).
	Tamil Tondar Padai (Army of Devotees).
1922	The Young Citizens' Union (Madras).
	Academy of Physical Culture (Bagalkot).

1923	All India Volunteer Conference held in Cocanada.
	Hindustani Seva Dal (All India Organization of the Congress).
	Nadar Youth League – Madurai.
	Andhra Youth League – Kistna.
	Yadhavakula Youth League – Trichinopoly.
	Rayalseema Youth League of Service – Chittoor.
	Self-Respect League.
	Non-Brahmin Youth League – Trichinopoly.
	Youth League Vizagapatam, Virudhungar, Ramnad, Cuddapah.
1928 Sept.	Simon Boycott Propaganda Committee. Simon Boycott Corps.
	All Bengal Students' Convention.
1929	Madras Youth Conference (Non-Brahmins).
	All India Students' Convention (Lahore).
	Madras Youth Conference.
	United Youth Conference.
1930–34	Civil Disobedience Movement.
1930 Feb.	Youth Leagues formed in Malabar & Madura.
12 March	March to Dandi.
	Madras Swadeshi League (Non-political in Objective).
	Bala Bharat Seva Sangham (Calicut).
	Kerala Yuvak Sangh.
1931	All India Students' Conference, Karachi.
1934	Congress Socialist Party formed.
1936	All India Students' Conference, Lucknow.
	All-India Students' Federation formally came into being in November 1936 and held its session at Lahore.
1937	All-India Muslim Students' Federation.
	AISF session, Madras.
1938	AISF session, Nagpur.
1939	Madras Presidency Students' Conference.
	AISF session, Delhi.
	AISF session, Calcutta.
1940	AISF session, Nagpur.
	AISF splits into Communist and Congress factions.
	Individual Satyagraha launched by Gandhiji.
1941	Rashtra Seva Dal formed.
	AISF session, Patna.

	Tamil Nadu Provincial Students' Federation formed.
1942	Quit India Movement was launched.
	All Kerala Students' Federation.
	All Kerala National Students' Union.
	Chirakkal Taluk National Students' Union.
	Tellicherry National Students' Union.
1943	National Youth Congress.
	National Students' Association.
	Andhra Planning Committee met on 25th February 1943.
	National Students' Organization formed (Andhra, Kerala, Tamilnadu).
	First South Indian National Students' Conference held at Madras on 13 & 14 November 1943.
	Cochin Students' National Organization.
	N.S.O. banned in Guntur, Kistna and East Godavari districts during November-December 1943.
	Andhra Provincial Students' Conference 12 to 14 November.
	Radical Students' Union.
1944	N.S.O. and its affiliated bodies baned on 13 January 1944.
	Radical Democratic Party – Radical Students' Union. (counter-blast to both Congress and the Communists).
	Pro-Congress Students' Convention at Nagpur 29-30 April.
	All India Students' Congress.
	Madras Branch of the Indian Students' Congress.
	Andhra Provincial Students' Congress – 3 May 1944.
	Malabar Students' Congress – 24 April 1944.
	AISF session, Bombay.
	National Youth League.
1945	National Youth Federation.
	This co-ordinated several youth organizations in the Madras city.
Sept.	Volunteer Organizations.
	R.S.S.
	Muslim National Guards.
	Azad Hind Fauz.
	Rashtra Seva Dal.

	Pro-Congress faction of the AISF renamed. AISC (All India Students' Congress).
1946	AISC session, Delhi.
1947	AISC session, Bangalore.
Aug. 15, 1947	India Wins Independence.

Appendix I

Statement showing the number of Volunteer Corps and Seva Samities (Figures upto 30th August 1921)

Province	*Seva Samiti No.*	*Total No. of members*	*No. of Volunteer Corps*	*Total No. of members*	*Remarks*
Assam	Goalpara 1+	8	Nil. Members enrolled as occasion arises for attendance at meetings, collection of subscription etc.	–	+ With Secretary and Treasurer
Bengal	Calcutta 10	897	Moffusil 61 Calcutta 9	Apprx. 4014 1072	The number of Volunteer Corps rose to 83 by Nov.
Bihar & Orissa	Bihar 122 Orissa 39	9073	Nil	–	–
Bombay	–	–	59	Apprx. 3500 Karachi 448 Bombay city 1395	33 Corps are in 12 dists. in the Presidency., 19 in Bombay City 7 in Karachi
Central Provinces	80	3500	150	1500	–
Delhi	No Reports	–	17	500 or 600	–
Madras	–	–	38	2000 or 3000 constantly varying	–
N.W.F.P.	2	200	11	Apprx. 1200	–

United Provinces	–	–	–	1200 200	Khilafat volunteers active on specific occasion in 3 dists.
Punjab	No Reports	–	–	–	–

Figures so far received. Volunteer Corps 345 with 15186 members.
Seva Samities 404 with 15269 members.

Source : Home Department Political File No. 329 of 1922.

Appendix II

Province	*National schools and colleges in 1921-22*		*Approximate effect of "Non-cooperation" on certain recognised Institutions upto March 1921*		
	Institutions	*Scholars*	*Scholars*	*Withdrawn from institutions*	
Madras	92*	5072*	171111	820	+
Bombay	189	17100	42416	2350	239
Bengal	190*	14819*	103107	11157	No information
United Provinces	137*	8476*	49171	2626	789
Punjab	69	8046	111078	1309	481
Burma	92	16218	36875	13031	747
Bihar & Orissa	442*	17330	23191	1826	+
C.P.	86*	6338	71759#	1824	454
Assam	38*	1908*	12186#	1139	356
NWFP	4*	120*	41342	Nil	–
Minor Admns :	10	1255	45508	571	70

* Opened till 31st July 1921.

\+ There was a general tendency to return.

\# Till January 1921.

Source : Quinquennial Report of the Progress of Education in India in 1917–1922.

Appendix III

Progress of Education in India 1919–1923

	Arts College		*Secondary Schools*				*Total*		*Primary Schools*	
	Institutions	*Scholars*	*High Schools*	*Scholars*	*Middle Schools*	*Scholars*	*Institutions*	*Scholars*	*Institutions*	*Scholars*
1919-20	150	52482	2113	632032	6595	649778	8708	1281810	155844	6133521
1920-21	160	48170	2184	600583	6739	653942	8923	1254525	159345	6327973
1921-22	167	45933	2248	594910	6739	644614	8987	1239524	160072	6310451
1922	170	47632	2246	595402	6731	643839	8977	1239241	159889	6304457
1923	174	52639	2312	632943	6732	698462	9044	1331405	162015	6600116

Source : Bamford, *Histories of the Non-Cooperation and Khilafat Movement*, p. 103.

Appendix IV

Statement showing the number on rolls and the average daily attendance in Educational Institutions on 31-3-1922
Secondary Schools for Girls

Place	High Schools				Middle Schools			
	1920-21		1921-22		1920-21		1921-22	
	No. on rolls	Average daily attendance	No. on rolls	Average daily attendance	No. on rolls	Average daily attendance	No. on rolls	Average daily attendance
Ganjam	–	–	–	–	–	–	140	81
Vizagapatam	171	144	187	127	–	–	–	–
Godavari	144	132	157	124	133	121	66	64
Kistna	149	117	136	105	–	–	–	–
Guntur	90	82	81	78	–	–	–	–
Bellary	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Anantapur	41	34	60	36	–	–	–	–
Cuddapah	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Nellore	82	81	91	86	–	–	–	–
Madras	2758	2244	2979	2283	50	50	384	315
Chingleput	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
North Arcot	174	166	196	182	127	107	149	101
Chittoor	–	–	–	–	137	132	134	125
S. Arcot	111	78	157	105	–	–	–	–
Tanjore	–	–	–	–	315	250	389	324

Trichinopoly	443	383	462	390	417	334	457	398
Madura	201	187	214	206	–	–	176	142
Ramnad	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Tinnevelly	226	217	232	224	564	504	619	567
Coimbatore	74	62	152	121	–	–	–	–
Salem	–	–	217	149	282	156	–	–
The Nilgiris	–	–	–	–	113	93	120	106
Malabar	1203	1090	1452	1257	379	330	275	235
S. Kanara	490	451	492	444	578	435	745	628
Agency division	6357	5468	7265	5917	3035	2512	3733	3149

Secondary Schools for Boys

Place	*High Schools*				*Middle Schools*			
	1920-21		*1921-22*		*1920-21*		*1921-22*	
	No. on rolls	*Average daily attendance*	*No. on rolls*	*Average daily attendance*	*No. on rolls*	*Average daily attendance*	*No. on rolls*	*Average daily attendance*
Ganjam	3669	3292	3270	3018	1497	1296	1225	1025
Vizagapatam	4474	3798	3993	3634	844	739	694	632
Godavari	6315	5783	5537	5088	1833	1569	1370	1143
Kistna	7186	6518	6811	6273	2113	1866	1858	1647
Guntur	4280	3905	3805	3530	1236	1114	959	857
(illegible)	1427	1270	1459	1370	527	465	463	405
Bellary	1753	1014	1738	1858	410	348	491	385
Anantapur	1178	963	1129	973	367	335	343	284
Cuddapah	1117	920	1115	937	412	340	316	264
Nellore	2436	2054	1837	1570	885	799	1256	1031
Madras	11597	10417	11807	10680	3598	3026	3586	3043
Chingleput	3923	3345	4193	3566	1424	1139	1483	1225
N. Arcot	4389	3905	4756	4162	590	471	497	375
Chittoor	1925	1746	2046	1902	664	580	643	548
S. Arcot	3771	3238	3787	3194	1385	1150	1356	1127
Tanjore	13208	11537	13295	11869	2247	1839	1736	1461
Trichinopoly	6043	5596	5891	5370	1455	1280	1491	1303
Madura	6558	5711	7454	6715	785	658	363	313

Ramnad	4621	4024	4805	3824	661	511	649	564
Tinnevelly	6709	6184	7328	6808	2737	2456	2186	1873
Coimbatore	5522	4975	5439	4983	378	275	266	234
Salem	2479	2353	2578	2203	312	253	464	373
The Nilgiris	297	280	368	314	272	215	276	226
Malabar	10558	9698	12560	11709	4019	3686	2783	2645
S. Canara	5029	4865	5208	4852	1289	1189	1423	1260
Agency Division	—	—	347	287	—	—	106	96
	120464	107451	122556	110416	31940	27605	28283	24439

Colleges for Men

Place	*Name of College*	*1920-21*		*1921-22*	
		No. on rolls	*Average daily attendance*	*No. on rolls*	*Average daily attendance*
Ganjam	Berhampore Nallikota College	34	30	26	24
	(illegible)	42	42	40	32
Vizagapatam	Vizianagaram Maharaja's College	343	318	336	318
	Vizagapatam AOU College	77	33	89	82
Godavari	Govt. College, Rajahmundry	223	205	242	235
"	Cocanada Pithapuram College	141	132	163	153
Kistna	Masulipatam Noble College	187	171	216	181
Guntur	Guntur College	134	131	105	92
Anantapur	Anantapur Ceded District College	117	104	155	149
Nellore	Nellore Venkatagiri Raja College	18	17	80	72
Madras	Presidency College	544	509	565	531
"	Madras Mohammedan College	33	31	21	24
Madras	Christian College	815	762	791	772
"	Pachaiyappa's College	961	930	969	945
"	Wesley College	118	115	133	128
N. Arcot	Vellore College	94	88	99	93
S. Arcot	Chidambaram Meenakshi College	64	60	97	86
Tanjore	Kumbakonam College	351	338	364	326

Tanjore	Mannurgudi College	149	144	144	142
Trichy	Trichinopoly St. Josephs	881	751	990	913
"	SPG College	459	442	500	416
"	National College	135	138	110	99
Madura	Madura American Mission	287	256	357	319
"	Native College	112	109	137	121
Tinnevelly	Tinnevelly CMS	37	33	53	47
"	Hindu College	135	127	153	138
Coimbatore	Coimbatore Govt. College	80	37	73	77
Malabar	Salem Municipal College	46	33	53	52
"	Palghat Victoria College	174	182	168	158
"	Tellicherry Brennen College	41	44	69	63
"	Calicut Christian College	50	49	51	50
"	Zamorin College	91	88	117	103
S. Canara	St. Aloysius	243	231	290	270
"	Govt. College	97	99	133	124
		7313	6779	7889	7325

Colleges for Women

Place	*Name of College*	*1920-21*		*1921-22*	
		No. on rolls	*Average daily attendance*	*No. on rolls*	*Average daily attendance*
Madras	Queen Mary's College	150	145	178	164
"	Madras Christian College	106	100	125	121
Tinnevelly	Palayamcottah College	8	11	10	10
S. Canara	M. St. Aloysius College	—	—	22	21
		264	256	335	316

Appendix V

List of Mass Movement and Action Taken

Sl. No.	*Name of the College*	*No. of students who took part in the movement*	*Date*	*Action taken*
1.	Loyola College, Madras	About 200 out of 700	23-10-1930	There was no trouble till October 1930. All the absentees were ordered to lose two days attendance. Parents were informed of what the boys had done. No scholarship holders participated.
2.	National College, Trichinopoly	107	From 1-9-1930 to 6-9-1930	In view of the fact that the students of the college behaved with great good sense on the days when picketing was on, the principal made a rule that usual rate of fines should just be doubled. Annas four.
3.	Govt. Brennen College, Tellicherry	63	2-7-1930	46 students of 11 University class; 17 students from V High Schools | For absence on that day without leave three days attendance was cancelled
4.	Pithapuram Raja's College, Cocanada	Not given	4-8-1930 & 1-9-1930	The number of absentees was high on the first occasion – work in the college went on as usual – warning given to the students. On the second occasion, the percentage of absentees in the college department was only (44 out of 527). Letters of assurances obtained from the students who took part in the movement – forfeiture of double attendance and a fine of 4 annas levied.
5.	Raja's College, Parlakimedi	Nil	–	To Junior Telugu Pandit who took part in the movement was dismissed and his father was retired on half of the pension he was otherwise eligible to.

Sl. No.	*Name of the College*	*No. of students who took part in the movement*	*Date*	*Action taken*
6.	Andhra Christian College, Guntur	38%	4-9-1930	A fine of Re. one was levied on the absentees and a warning given to all the students.
7.	St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly	26.87% 37% 13% 8%	2-9-1930 4-9-1930 5-9-1930 6-9-1930	Four students were excluded from the "Clives Hostel". 3 students were arrested by the Police—but were set free on their apologising.
8.	Govt. Victoria College, Palghat	Nil	—	—
9.	St. Agnes College, Mangalore	Nil	—	—
10.	Venkadagiri Rajah's College, Nellore	83 45	4-8-1930 29-8-1930	On the 4th August was the first incident of the kind and as it was felt that it would not be repeated, no penal action was taken. On the 29th August—although the proportion of absentees on this occasion was similar than on the previous occasion a fine of rupee one was imposed on each of the absentees. On the following day, the students expressed their regret for their action and assured the principal that they would not take any more part in the movement; on the strength of the assurance the payment of fine was excused.
11.	Mre. A.V.N. College, Vizagapatam	108	1-9-1930	The absence of these students was brought to the notice of the chairman of the college committee who is also the Collector of the District and their attendance for two days was cancelled.

				They were also informed that for such absence in future their conduct will be construed as misconduct on their part for purposes of their term certificates.
12.	Noble College, Masulipatam	Not given	–	There were two half-hearted half day hartals. The principal says that ordinary fines suffices for one and rupee one fine and a warning for the other.
13.	Govt. College, Mangalore	–	–	
14.	Annamalai University	–	–	Vide – Page 6 of the *Hindu*, dated 5 November, 1930.
15.	Wesley College, Royapettah	43	29-8-1930	All were present on the next working day and opportunity was taken to point out to them the seriousness of their action which they had clearly not realised; they were also warned and advised.
16.	Voorhees College, Vellore	Nil	–	Nil
17.	Malabar Christian College, Calicut	No. of senior intermediate students	About the beginning of August (one day)	They were fined and in a personal talk afterwards they promised the principal not to repeat their action. Since then there is no such case.
18.	National Theosophical College, Adyar	Nil	–	–
19.	Islamiah College, Vaniyambadi	Nil	–	–
20.	Holy Cross College, Teppakulam	Nil	–	–
21.	Tarah Tucker College, Palamcottah	Nil	–	–

Sl. No.	*Name of the College*	*No. of students who took part in the movement*	*Date*	*Action taken*
22.	Theosophical College, Madanapalle	Nil	–	–
23.	Salem College, Salem	Nil	–	–
24.	Zamorin's College, Calicut	A. No. of students 12	9-7-1930 28-8-1930	On the first occasion in consultation with the District Educational Officer, Malabar, a meeting of the heads of important educational institutions was called to discuss the situation and it was decided that it being the first of its kind the students might be let off with a severe warning. On the 2nd occasion a dozen students who took the leading part were suspended and were readmitted only on their undertaking not to "run a amuck" thereafter – the college is working very smoothly.
25.	Govt. Training College, Rajahmundry	Nil	–	–
26.	St. John's College, Palamcottah	Nil	–	–
27.	Ceded Dist. College, Anantapur	About 100	4-8-1930	The absentees came back to the college the next day and there were no further demonstration. All the students were then assembled together and were told that for that time the ordinary punishment viz., cancellation of 2 days attendance for one day's absence without leave would be imposed and the next time severe steps would be taken. There has been no further trouble since then.

28.	Govt. Arts College, Rajahmundry	Nil	–	–
29.	Govt. College, Kumbakonam	Nil	–	–
30.	St. Xavier's College, Palamcottah	Nil	–	–
31.	American College, Madura	Nil	–	–
32.	Govt. College, Coimbatore	Nil	–	–
33.	Hindu College, Masulipatam	The whole College except about 100 students	–	There was only one case – All the students except about ten absented themselves where the members of the working committee were arrested at Delhi. As a punishment of days attendance per absentee was cut off. The absentees were also warned. Since then no trouble.
34.	Bishop Haber College, Trichinopoly	42% 60% 32% 45%	2-9-1930 3-9-1930 4-9-1930 5-9-1930	Usual fines for absence were executed except from those absent only on 3rd & 4th September when picketing made it impossible for a member of who came including lecturers to obtain admission. Absence on other days was voluntary and the principal has fined those absent on either of those days for the whole period of their absence. The parents of such students were written.

Sl. No.	*Name of the College*	*No. of students who took part in the movement*	*Date*	*Action taken*
35.	Hindu College, Tinnevelly	Nil	–	–
36.	Kallikota College, Berhampore	70%	29-8-1930 (A.N.)	The only case of mass absenteeism was on the afternoon of 29-8-1930. That day some ladies did picketing at the college gate and students found it difficult to enter college. The absentees were marked absent. It was believed that any further action might aggravate the situation. Classes were full the next working day. Situation has been normal since then.
37.	Maharaja's College, Vizhianagaram	Not known	1-8-1930 4-9-1930	On the first occasion the absentees were fined two days' attendance and were warned. On the second occasion the number of absentees was small and the absentees were fined two day's attendance and one rupee each. No. trouble since then.
38.	Findley College, Mannargudi	Nil	–	–
39.	Madura College	Most of the students number not known	11-11-1930	–
40.	Christian College, Madras	Nil	–	–

41.	Pachaiyappa's College, Madras	–	–	There was a demonstration on 22-8-1930. The Principal stated that he was unable to get definite evidence.
42.	St. Aloysius College, Mangalore	–	–	There was absenteeism on 16-10-1930. Two days fine for absence and apology required.

Source: USS File, Secret, No. 699/H, 1930, TNA.

Appendix VI

In regard to the long term policy, the Government of India proposed the following suggestions as to the main lines on which the reorganization might follow as far as institutions of university status were concerned :

(*i*) "Where it does not already exist, the proctorial system should be introduced and the proctors given real authority to enforce and maintain discipline.

(*ii*) The tutorial system should be widely extended in all types of university with a view to bringing all students into close personal contact with people likely to exercise a restraining influence over their conduct.

(*iii*) Without reducing the total facilities for higher education individual institutions should be limited to a size which will make them more easy to control and their members more conscious of belonging to a corporate unit to which loyalty is due.

(*iv*) The reorganization of the High School system should be taken in hand as soon as possible in order that Intermediate classes may be abolished and the 3 years degree course introduced. This has been approved in principle by the Inter University Board.

(*v*) The rules for entry to Government services should be revised so as to discourage unsuitable candidates from seeking admission to Universities in the hope of improving their chances of passing the examinations.

(*vi*) Immediate steps should be taken by the establishment of employment bureau or other means to advise parents of pupils in High Schools and Universities about careers and to assist them in finding employment. The unemployed graduate is at one and the same time a standing criticism of as well as a menace to the society to which he belongs."

Source : Home Pol. (Internal), Secret, File No. 3/58/42, NAI.

Bibliography

Primary Documents

Archives of the Theosophical Society, Adyar, Madras. Papers of Annie Besant.

National Archives of India, New Delhi (NAI), Records of the Home Department of Government of India, filed as Home Public and Home Political.

Files are divided into A, B and Deposit categories.

Tamil Nadu Archives, Madras (TNA).

District Calendar of Events of the CDM, August-December 1942, Madras, 1943.

Fortnightly Reports on the Internal Political Situation 1900–1947 (ER).

Madras Native Newspaper Reports (MNNR).

Proceedings of the following departments :

Home, Education;

Home, Judicial;

Home, Miscellaneous;

Home, Public.

The Non-cooperation and Khilafat Movements in the Madras Presidency (Madras, n.d.) [C. 1923].

Under Secretary's Safe Files (USS File).

Official Publications

Bamford, P.C., *Histories of the Non-cooperation and Khilafat Movement*, Delhi, 1925.

Chopra, P.N. (Ed.), *The Quit India Movement*, New Delhi, 1976; *Who is Who of Indian Martyrs*, Vols. I and II, New Delhi.

Report of the Government of India on Congress Responsibility for Civil Disturbances 1942–43; Full Text in *The Annual Register*, 1942, Vol. II.

The Quinquennial Reviews of the Progress of Education in India, 1917–22.

Collections of Documents, Speeches, Writings and Autobiographies

Appadorai, A., *India: Studies in Social and Political Development 1947–67*, New Delhi, 1968.

Arundale, G.S., *The Path of Leadership—Being the Presidential address to the Second Madras Students' Convention*, Madras, 1918.

Arya Bhavan (Pub.), *Report of the First Convention of the Bombay Presidency Students' Federation*, Bombay, 1918.

Banerjee, S.N., *A Nation in Making—Being the Reminiscences of Fifty years of Public Life*, Bombay, 1963.

Besant, Annie, *The Besant Spirit*, Vols. 2 and 3, Adyar, 1939;

How India Wrought for Freedom, Adyar, 1915;

Builder of New India, Adyar, 1942.

Baliga, B.S., *Studies in Madras Administration*, Vol. I, Madras, 1960.

Chaudhari, Nirad C., *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian*, Bombay, 1976.

Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, Vols. 42, 44, 45, Ahmedabad, 1971.

Cumming John (Ed.), *Political India 1832–1932: A Collection of Writings*, London, 1932.

Datta, Iswara K., *Congress Cyclopaedia, The Indian National Congress 1885–1920*, Vol. I, Delhi, 1967.

Dobbin, Christine, E., *Basic Documents in the Development of Modern India and Pakistan 1835–1947*, New York, 1970.

Gandhiji's Correspondence with the Government, 1942–44, Ahmedabad, 1957.

Ganesh (Pub.), *Mohammed Ali Jinnah—An Ambassador of Unity*, Madras, 1918.

Ghose, Aurobindo, *Bandemataram, Early Political Writings–1*, Pondicherry, 1972.

Gopal, S. (Ed.), *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, Vol. V., Bombay, 1972.

Government of India, *Terrorism in India, 1917–1936*, New Delhi, 1974.

Hingorani, Anand T. (Ed.), *To the Students by Mahatma Gandhi*, Karachi, 1943.

Jayakar, M.R., *The Story of My Life*, Vol. I, Bombay, 1958.

Karve, D.G. and Ambekar, D.V. (Ed.), *Speeches and Writings of Gopalakrishna Gokhale*, Vol. III, Bombay, 1967.

Mansergh, N. & Lumby, E.W.R. (Eds.), *The Transfer of Power 1942–47*, Vol. II, London, 1971.

Mazumdar, Amvika Charan, *The Indian National Evolution, A Brief Survey of the Origins and Progress of the Indian National Congress*, Madras, 1917.

Nair, Sankaran C., *Autobiography*, Madras, 1966;
Gandhi and Anarchy, Madras, 1922.

Nambudiripad, E.M.S., *How I became a Communist*,, Trivandrum, 1976;
Atmakatha (Malayalam), Autobiography, Trivandrum, 1969.

Nehru, Jawaharlal, *An Autobiography*, London, 1955.

Philips, C.H. (Ed.), *Evolution of India and Pakistan 1858–1947: Select Documents*, London, 1962.

Prasad, Rajendra, *Autobiography*, Bombay, 1957.

Publications Division (Pub.), *1921 Movement : Reminiscences*, New Delhi, 1921.
Selected Speeches of Subhas Chandra Bose, New Delhi, 1974.

Report of the Society for the Promotion of National Education for the Year 1923.

Report of the Thirty-eighth Session of the Indian National Congress 1923.

Ramaswamy and Natarajan, L., *Gandhi Malar Manavarukku* (Tamil Translation), Karaikudi, 1943.

Sen, S.P., *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. II, Calcutta, 1973.

Sitaramayya, Pattabhi, B., *History of the Indian National Congress, 1885–1935*, Reprinted, New Delhi, 1969.

Tarachand, *History of the Freedom Movement in India*, Vol. IV, New Delhi, 1972.

Zaidi, A.M., *The Encyclopaedia of Indian National Congress*, Vol. V, New Delhi, 1978.

Secondary Sources

Aggarwala, R.N., *National Movements and Constitutional Development in India*, Delhi, 1956.

Allan and Wendy Scarfe, *J.P., His Biography*, New Delhi, 1975.

Altbach, Philip G., *Student Politics in Bombay*, Bombay, 1968.

Barnett, Marguerite Ross, *The Politics of Cultural Nationalism in South India*, New Jersey, 1976.

Basu, Aparna, *The Growth of Education and Political Development in India*, 1898–1920, Bombay, 1974.

Besant, Annie, *The Birth of New India*, Adyar, 1917;
The Future of Indian Politics, Adyar, 1922.

Bhuyan, Arun Chandra, *The Quit India Movement*, Delhi, 1975.

Bose, Nemai Sadhan, *Indian Awakening and Bengal*, Calcutta, 1976.

Bose, Subhas Chandra, *The Indian Struggle 1920–1934*, Bombay, 1964.

Brecher, Michael, *Nehru : A Political Biography*, London, 1959.

Brijbhushan, Jamila, *Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya*, New Delhi, 1976.

Brown, Judith M., *Gandhi's Rise to Power, Indian Politics*, 1915–1922, London, 1972;
Gandhi and Civil Disobedience Movement : The Mahatma in Indian Politics, 1928–1934, London, 1977.

Chandra, Prabhodh, *Student Movement in India*, Lahore, 1938.

Chintamani, C.Y., *Indian Politics Since the Mutiny*, Waltair, 1937.

Choudhary, Sukhbir, *Growth of Nationalism in India*, Vol. I, Delhi, 1973.

Chowdari, Rudrayya, G., *Prakasam—A Political Biography*, New Delhi, 1971.

Datta, K.K., *Dawn of Renascent India*, Bombay, 1964.

Dikshit, S., *Nationalism and Indian Education*, Delhi, 1969.

Curran, J.A. Jr., *Militant Hinduism in Indian Politics : A Study of the RSS*, New York, 1951.

Coupland, Reginald, *India—A Restatement*, Bombay, 1945.

Edwardes, Michael, *Nehru : A Political Biography*, London, 1971.

Gopalan, A.K., *In the Cause of the People—Reminiscences*, Bombay, 1973.

Gopal, Sarvepalli, *Jawaharlal Nehru, A Biography*, Vol. I, Delhi, 1976.

Gupta, Manmathnath, *History of the Indian Revolutionary Movement*, Bombay, 1972.

Irschick, Eugene F., *Politics and Social Conflict in South India : The Non-Brahman Movement and Tamil Separatism, 1916–1929*, Berkeley, 1969.

Joshi, P.M., *Student Revolts in India*, Bombay, 1972.

Kaushik, P.D., *The Congress Ideology and Programme, 1920–1947*. Bombay, 1964.

Kebschull, Harvey G., *The Politics in Transitional Societies*, New York, 1968.

Kuppuswamy, B., *Social Change in India*, Delhi, 1972.

Low, D.A. (Ed.), *Congress and the Raj : Facets of the Indian Struggle 1917-49*, London, 1968.

Majumdar, R.C., *Struggle for Freedom*, Bombay, 1968.

Masselos, Jim, *Nationalism on the Indian Sub-Continent*, Melbourne, 1972.

Menon, K.P.S., *Many Worlds*, Bombay, 1965. *The Resurgence of India*, Delhi, 1963.

McCully, Bruce, *English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism*, Gloucester, 1966.

Mehrotra, S.M., *The Emergence of Indian National Congress*, Delhi, 1971.

Misra, B.B., *The Indian Political Parties*, Bombay, 1976.

Muhammed, Shan, *Freedom Movement in India, The Role of Ali Brothers*, New Delhi, 1979.

Moraes, Frank, *Jawaharlal Nehru—A Biography*, New York, 1956.

Murugesan and Subramanyan, C.S., *Singaravelu—First Communist in South India*, Delhi, 1975.

Nair, Sreekumaran, M.P., *Values in Conflict*, Bombay, 1973.

Narayan, Jay Prakash, *Towards Struggle* (Selected Manifestoes, Speeches and Writings), Ed. by Yusuf Meherally, Bombay, 1946.

Nehru, Jawaharlal, *The Discovery of India*, Bombay, 1966.

Nevinson, Henry, W., *The New Spirit in India*, London, 1908.

Nurullah, Syed and Naik, J.P., *A Students' History of Education in India 1800–1973*, Bombay, 1974.

Overstreet, Gene and Windmiller, Marshal, *Communism in India*, Bombay, 1961.

Panikkar, K.M., *Asia and Western Dominance*, London, 1953. *The Foundations of New India*, London, 1963.

Pillai, A.K., *Congressum Keralavum* (Malayalam), Trichur, 1935.

Prakasa, Sri, *Annie Besant, As Woman and as Leader*, Bombay, 1954.

Prakash, Indra, *A Review of the History and Work of the Hindu Mahasabha and the Hindu Sanghatan Movement*., New Delhi, 1938.

Prasad, Amba, *The Indian Revolt of 1942*, Delhi, 1958.

Rahman, Abdur, K.K., *Kerala Congress Directory* (Malayalam), Ernakulam, 1964.

Rai, Lajpat, *England's Debt to India*, New York, 1944; *The Problem of National Education in India*, Delhi, 1966.

Raman, T.A., *Report on India*, London, 1943.

Ranga, N.G., *Fight for Freedom*, Delhi, 1968.

Rao, Kodanda. P., *The Right Honourable V.S. Srinivasa Sastri—A Political Biography*, Bombay, 1963.

Rao, Rajeswara, P., *T. Prakasam*, New Delhi, n.d.

Ravindran, T.K., *Vaikkam Satyagraha and Gandhi*, Trichur, 1975.

Reddy, Muni, M., *The Student Movement in India*, Lucknow, 1947.

Regional Records Survey Committee, *The History of Freedom Movement in Kerala*, Vol. I, Trivandrum, 1970.

Ronaldshay, Earl of, *The Heart of Aryavarta*, Bombay, 1925.

Rothermund, Dietmar, *The Phases of Indian Nationalism and Other Essays*, Bombay, 1970.

Sahai, Govind, *42 Rebellion—An Authentic Review of the Great Upheaval of 1942*, Delhi, 1947.

Saxena, V.K., *Indian Reaction to British Politics* (1898–1911), Delhi.

Seal, Anil, *The Emergence of Indian Nationalism : Competition and Collaboration in the Later Nineteenth Century*, Cambridge, 1968.

Shinde, A.B., *Political Consciousness Among College Students,* Bombay, 1972.

Sinha, Sasadhar, *Indian Independence in Perspective,* Bombay, 1964.

Singh, Amrik and Altbach, Philip G., *The Higher Learning in India*, Delhi, 1974.

Smith, Anthony, D., *Nationalist Movements*, Great Britain, 1976.

Sunthralingam, R., *Politics and Nationalist Awakening in South India, 1852–1891*, Arizona, 1974.

Taunk, B.M., *Non-Cooperation Movement in Indian Politics,* Delhi, 1978.

Tendulkar, D.G., *Mahatma : Life of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi*, Vol. 3, Bombay, 1952; Vol. 5, Bombay, 1952; Vol. 6, Bombay, 1953.

Tripathi, Amales, *The Extremist Challenge*, New Delhi, 1967.

Vajpeyi, J.N., *The Extremist Movement in India*, Allahabad, 1974.

Varma, Ravindra, *Wither the Students' Movement, or a Plea for the Establishment of a National Union of Students,* Calcutta, 1948.

Washbrook, David, *The Emergence of Provincial Politics: The Madras Presidency 1870–1920*, Cambridge, 1976.

Weiner, Myron, *The Politics of Scarcity*, Bombay, 1963.

Williams, Monier, *Modern India and the Indians,* London, 1879.

Zaidi, Moin, *The Way out to Freedom*, New Delhi, 1973.

Hand-Bills and Pamphlets

AISF Circular No. 37/42, 15 August 1942, issued by Arun Bose.

Appeal to the Students of the Madras Province, 22 January 1928, published by M.G. Naidu.

Bravo Student Brothers, issued by Congress.

Choice Before Students, 10 September 1930, Mahatma Gandhi.

Close Schools and Colleges, Utkal Congress Bulletin-3.

Communist Party's Call to Students—1940, issued by the Calcutta District Committee, Communist Party.

Indian Students' Congress Manifesto.

Instruction to PCC from the AICC.

Programmes for Students, issued by Congress.

Students and Politics, P.B.L. No. 119, 29 November, published by Madras Publicity Bureau.

The Students' Congress Explained, issued by the Madras Branch of the Indian Students' Congress.

Why This Province Lags behind, a Marathi document, Part I, 30 March 1943.

Newspapers and Journals

Adyar Bulletin, Amrita Bazar Patrika, Andhra Prakasika, Bhavan's Journal, Bombay Chronicle, Daily Digest, Desabakthan, Desamata, Dinamani, Dravidan, Free Press, Forum, Hindunesan, Indian Annual Register, Indian Express, Indian Patriot, Journal of Indian

History, Journal of Kerala Studies, Justice, Kerala Patrika, Kesari, Krishna Patrika, Lokopakari, Madras Christian College Magazine, Manorama, Modern Review, Mysore Star, Mathrubhumi, New India, Non-Brahman, Quami Report, Sathi, Satyavadi, Swadesamitram, Swarajya, The Daily Gezette, The Hindu, The Leader, The Theosophist, The Indian Review, The West Coast Reformer, University College Calendar, Trivandrum.; Voice of Youth, Wednesday Review, Western Star.

Index

AEIM College, Guntur, 52
Achar, A.R.V., 104
Achuthan, R., 128, 130, 133, 182-83
Adiseshia, Malcolm S., 166
Afghani, Latif, 128, 131, 133
Agashe, 53
Ahmed, K.M., 135
Aiyar, Mahalingam, 105
Aiyar, S. Subramonia, 51, 53
Aiyar, V.V.S., 197
Akbar, 144
Alexander, Horace, 159
Ali, Aruna Asaf, 189
Ali, Shaukat, 82
All Bihar Students' Conference, 120
All India Muslim Students' Federation, 121, 137
All India Students' Conference, 120
All India Students' Federation, 120, 145, 178, 184, 189-90, 201-03
All Kerala National Students' Association, 164-65
All Kerala Students' Union, 132
All Orissa Students' Conference, 53
Amery, L.S., 155
Amma, Kuttimalu, 185
Ammal, N. Sivakami, 66
Amrita Bazar Patrika, 30, 34
Andhra Ratna Young Men's Association, 97
Andhra Students' Conference, 53-54
Andhra Youth League, 97
Andrews, C.F., 18
Annamalai University Organization, 149
Anusilan Samiti, 29
Appanna, 161
Arasu, V.T., 95
Arundale, G.S., 47, 51-53
Arya, Ettiraj, 39
Arya, Kamala Devi, 189
Aryaratna, G.P., 49
Ashe, R.W.D.E., 38-39, 197
Ashraf, K.M., 123, 125
Ashutosh Mukerjea Committee of Inquiry, 3
Athenaeum, 29
Auckland, 2
Aurangzeb, 144
Austin, T., 150
Avadhanand, 104
Ayyangar, C.V. Venkataramana, 66
Ayyangar, Srinivasa, 93
Ayyar, K.V. Srinivasa, 54
Ayyar, Sadasiva, 51
Ayyar, Sivaswami, 47
Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam, 131, 137

Baden Powell Boy Scouts Association, Ceylon, 49
Bala Bharath Samiti, 29-30
Baliga, K. Narahari, 108
Battliwala, S.B., 126
Bande Matram, 29
Bande Matram, 30, 34
Banerjee, Kalicharan, 3
Banerjee, Surendranath, 28, 34, 40
Bava, Imbichi, 132
Behari Students' Conference, 52-54
Benares Central Hindu College, 6
Bengal National College, 36
Bentinck, William, 2
Besant, Annie, 3, 5-7, 45-54, 59-61, 64-65, 72, 76-77, 197-99
Bharatha Metha Association, 39

Bharati, Subramonia, 31
Bhargava, Prem, 121
Bharucha, Perin, 145
Bhimasankaram, P.V.M., 177
Blavatsky, 50
Bombay Association, 20
Bombay Presidency Students' Federation, 53
Bonnerjee, W.C., 20
Bose, Bepin, 69
Bose, Khudiram, 38
Bose, Rash Behari, 149
Bose, Sarat Chandra, 121, 123
Bose, Subhas Chandra, 88, 94-95, 99, 112, 123
Bourne, 7
Boyd, 151
Brahmachari, Nilakanta, 39, 197
Brati Samiti, 29
Bratthwaite, P.P., 9, 13
British Indian Association, 20
Burke, 5

Calcutta Madrassa, 1
Calcutta Presidency College scandal, 3, 5, 16-17
Calcutta University Commission, 1917-1919, 2
Carlyle Circular, 27-28, 40
Chandrasekhar, 167
Chattopadhyaya, Kamala Devi, 95, 112
Chetti, P.S. Bhashyam, 101
Chetti, Singaravelu, 83
Chetti, V. Chakarai, 31
Chettur, 153
Chiang Kai Shek, 167
Chinnaswamy, R., 80
Chirakkal Taluk National Students Association, 164
Chittagong bomb raid case, 40
Chittoor-North Arcot Students' Association, 53
Christian College, Madras, 17
Citizen of India, 8
Civil disobedience movement, and student unrest, 93-113
Clive, 5
Compulsory Primary Act, 1919, 2
Cripps, Stafford, 135, 201
Cunningham, 111-112
Curzon, 1, 6

Damodaran, Ambadi, 177
Das, Jatindra Nath, 95
Das, R.C., 73-74
Dawn Society, 29
Defence of India Act, 124
Dinamani, 185
Diraviyam, K., 165, 185
D'Rozio, 3
Duff, 3
Duncan, 29
Dutt, R.C., 59

East India Company Act of 1813, 2
Education, political agitation, 57-69
Educational Commission of 1882, 2
Elankath, K.R., 16
Emerson, 111
Englishman, 10-11

Farooqui, M., 123, 135
Fuller, Bampfylde, 27

Gandhi, Kasturba, 185
Gandhi, M.K., 72-79, 84, 86-88, 99-100, 107, 111-12, 119, 123, 125, 129, 135, 142-44, 146, 153, 156, 161-62, 166-67, 169-70, 176-77, 182-83, 185-86, 190, 199-202
Gandhi-Irwin Pact, 99-100, 111-12, 200
Gandhi Malar Manavarukku, 144
Ganesham, 129, 133
Ganjam District Students' Conference, 53
Gardiner, A.F., 8, 53
Ghazi, Muhammad, 131
Ghose, A.K., 28
Ghose, Aurobindo, 38, 40
Ghose, Manmohan, 20
Giri, V.V., 65
Gokhale, G.K., 18, 40, 57, 199
Gopalakrishnayya, Duggirala, 81-82
Government of India Act of 1919, 93
Government of India Order of 1907, 62-63
Gwyer, Maurice, 129

Hallett, Maurice, 158
Halugapp, 162
Hardikar, N.S., 96, 118

Hare, David, 3
Harijan, 144, 183
Harwani, Anwar, 122
Hasan, Yakub, 78, 80-81
Hastings, 5
Hind Praja, 182, 186
Hindu, 104, 150
Hindu College Calcutta, 19
Hindustani Seva Dal, 96-97
Hingorani, Anand T., 144
Hitler, 124, 134, 201
Hogg, A.G., 104
Home Rule movement, impact on students, 45-54
Hunter, Mark, 30, 33-34, 36, 58
Hussain, Iftikar, 121

Ibrahim, N. Ali, 185
Iftikharuddin, Mian, 136
India, 39
India—a Nation, 59
Indian Boy Scouts Association, 50, 198
Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908, 181
Indian Express, 150
Indian Patriot, 33
Indian Sociologist, 38
Indian Universities Act of 1904, 2
Irwin, 99-100, 111-12, 200
Iyengar, Kasturiranga, 59, 73
Iyengar, Srinivasa, 99
Iyer, G. Subramonia, 28-29, 31, 197
Iyer, Ramakrishna, 29
Iyer, T.R. Krishnaswamy, 39
Iyer, Vanchi, 39, 197

Jammulamadugu Mail Robbery, 164
Jayakar, M.R., 86
Jinnah, Muhammad Ali, 121-22, 184, 201
Job, G.V., 166
Joshua, J.P., 104

Kabir, Humayun, 121, 189
Kakinada Bomb Case, 163
Kakinada riot, 38
Kalani, Hemu, 168
Kamath, K. Sanjiva, 53
Kanakalava, 168
Kanarivala, Vinod, 168
Karunakaran, K.P., 164
Keithan, R.R., 177
Kelappan, 102
Kerala Students' Federation, 164
Khan, Hameed, 80
Khilafat movement, 82
Kidwai, 137
Korath, V.M., 184
Kripalani, Acharya, 189
Krishna, K.B., 132
Krishnamachari, 107
Krishnan, K. Sivarama, 131
Krishna patrika, 34
Krishnaswami, H., 185
Krishnaswami, P., 122
Krishnavarma, Shyamji, 38, 48
Kulkarni, S.R., 163
Kurnool District Students' Federation, 165
Kutty, Narayanan, 132

Lakshmipathi, 98, 100-01
Lawley, Aurthur, 49
League of Youth, 97-98
Life of Nelson, 5
Life of Wellingdon, 5
London Indian Society, 20
Loyola College, Madras, 130
Lyon Circular, 28

Macaulay, T.B., 2, 5, 58
Macphail, 17
Madras Christian College, Madras, 7
Madras Law College, 108
Madras Native Association, 20
Madras Students' Convention, 53-54, 120, 128-29
Madras Students' Organisation, 126
Madras Youth League, 97, 100-01, 103
Malabar Students' Conference, 53
Malaviya, Madan Mohan, 52, 84-85
Markandayan, 101
Masani, M.R., 122-23
Maxwell, Reginald, 136
Meherally, Yousuf, 95, 112
Mehta, Asoka, 189
Mehta, Pherozeshah, 20, 199
Menon, K.P.S., 45, 76-77
Menon, K. Ramunni, 183, 185

Menon, P. Balachandra, 132
Menon, R., 165
Metcalfe, 33, 38
Mill, 5
Miller, 3
Milton, 5
Minto, 45, 48, 54
Minto-Morley Reforms, 45, 54
Misra, Raj Narain, 168
Montague-Chelmsford Reforms, 72, 199
Moonje, B.S., 96
Morley, 1, 45, 54
Moses, Janaki, 166
Mudaliar, C.N. Muthuranga, 184-86
Muhammed, K.P., 183-84
Muhammed, Sultan, 129, 131
Mukerjea, Ashutosh, 3
Mukerji, Asutosh, 86
Mukerji, Hiren, 125
Murtaza, Syed, 136

Nadar, K. Kamaraja, 112, 189
Nadar Youth League, 97
Naidu, Varadarajulu, 189
Naidu, Venkataswamy, 184
Nair, Appu, 80
Nair, C. Sankaran, 14, 33, 86
Nambiar, M.P. Govindan, 103
Namboodiripad, C.M. Yagnamurthy, 132
Namboodiripad, E.M.S., 102, 165
Naoroji, Dadabhai, 19-20, 32
Narasimhan, 129
Narayan, Jayaprakash, 168-69
Narayanan, K., 104
Nariman, K.F., 94-95, 98, 112
Natarajan, A.L., 144
Natesan, G.A., 78
National Council of Education 1906, 36
National Students' Organization, 179-80
Nedungadi, Ramachandra, 105
Nehru, Jawaharlal, 95, 99-100, 112-113, 118-23, 126, 128, 136-37, 183, 187, 200
Nehru, Kamla, 187
Nehru, Motilal, 99, 112, 200
Nellor District Students' Conference, 53
Nellor Progressive Union, 29-30
New India, 46-47, 51-52, 54, 59-60, 63-65, 198
New Student, 54
Newsam, W.O., 157
Non-Brahmin Youth League, 97
Non-Cooperation movement, and students, 72-89
Northcote, Stafford, 58
Northern Circar Students' Conference, 53

Olcott, 50
Oliver Twist, 1

Pachaiyappa's College, 12, 107-08
Pal, Bipin Chandra, 21, 27-29, 31-33, 36-38, 73-74, 197
Palghat Students' Union, 132
Paliwal, 137
Panikkar, K.M. 19, 112
Panikkar, P. Kuttikreshna, 102
Pantulu, Vedavaram Prasada Rao, 37
Papworth, H.C., 129, 154
Parameswaran, D., 67
Parthasarathy, 104
Patel, Vallabhbhai, 129
Pearce, F.G., 49
Pillai, G. Parameswaran, 20
Pillai, N. Raman, 20
Pillai, Nataswaram, 35
Pillai, V.D. Chidambaram, 37, 39, 45, 73, 85, 197
Pittendrigh, 17
Prakasam, 112
Prasad, Madan Mohan, 125
Presidency College, Madras, 9-10, 58

Quami Report, 75

Ragnavan, K.S., 155
Rai, Lajpat, 4, 38, 74
Raja, H.D., 98
Raja, P.S. Kumaraswami, 112
Raja of Pithapur's College, Kakinada, 17
Rajagopalachari, C., 73, 78-80, 84, 101, 127, 129, 161
Rajagopalan, S., 129
Rajahmundry College, 30
Rajam, A.S., 53
Rajam, P.T., 15
Rajan, T.S.S., 101
Rajya Laxmi Devi, 119
Ram, C. Kaunali, 137
Ram, N.C., 128-29

Ramachandran, G., 178
Ramakrishnaiyah, 34
Ramanujachari, K., 9
Ramaseshau, K.S., 67
Ramaswami, Paul, 105
Ramaswami, V., 144
Ramaswamy, N., 67
Ranade, 11-12
Ranga, N.G., 119, 126, 162, 181
Rangachari, 34
Rangam, Moda, 34
Rao, A. Kameshwar, 119
Rao, Amrita, 59
Rao, B. Subba, 101, 163
Rao, Bedi Narayana, 34
Rao, Ganeswara, 31
Rao, Hanumantha, 129, 161
Rao, Hari Sarvothama, 32, 37
Rao, J. Ramachandra, 30-31, 33, 36
Rao, K. Ramachandra, 132
Rao, K. Vinayaka, 101
Rao, Krishna, 59
Rao, M.S. Appa, 184
Rao, Nanjunda, 59
Rao, R. Ranga, 20
Rao, S. Appa, 183
Rao, S. Rameshagiri, 163
Rao, S. Ranga, 163
Rao, Sunder, 165
Rao, Surapaneni Seshagiri, 163
Rao, T. Ramachandra, 34
Rashid, Abdul, 188
Rashid, M., 184
Ray, P.C., 98
Rayalseema Youth League of Service, 97
Reddi, G. Venkata, 165
Reddi, K.V., 129
Reddi, Nallappa Reddi Subha, 30
Reddi, Virupaksha, 162
Reddy, B. Gopala, 184
Reddy, P. Sundarasama, 181
Resolution of Government of India of 1904, 2
Resolution of Government of India of 1913, 2
Reynolds, 8
Risely, H.H., 27, 40
Risely Circular, 18, 40, 68
Rollo, J. C., 12
Ronaldshay, Earl, 2
Roosevelt, 167
Rowlatt Satyagraha, 72
Royal Commission, 93

S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly, 8
Sadasivam, T., 105
Sahai, Govind, 158
Sahib, Allapichai, 189
Sahib, Khan, 165
Sait, Haji Abdur Sathar, 165
Saithey, 5
Sakrekar, Dinkar, 178, 182
Samyukta Karnataka, 162
Sanatan Dharma Paripalana Sabha, 50
Sanatan Sampradaya, 29
Sankunni, 66
Sanskrit College, Benaras, 1
Santhanam, K., 16, 78, 112
Sarma, S.D., 155
Sarma, S.T.V. 101
Sastri, Jagamaiyah, 34
Sastri, V.S. Srinivasa, 78, 127
Satnarain, M., 163
Satyamurthi, S., 94, 106-07, 112
Satyamurthy, 73
Secret Organization of Russians, 38
Seetharamaiyah, Godapalli, 34
Self-Respect League, 97
Senthamarakshi, 185
Sewell, J.D.W., 7
Shah, M.L., 120, 122
Shankarappa, 168
Shelley, 5
Shroff, Navinchand Iswarlal, 168
Sitaramayya, Pattabhi, 84
Simon, John, 93
Simon Boycott Propaganda Committee, 94
Simon Commission, 93-95, 101, 200
Singh, Pratap, 144
Siva, Subramonia, 197
Sivaji, 144
Skinner, 7-8
Society for Acquisition of General Knowledge, 19
Society for the Promotion of National Feeling, 29
South Kanara Satyagraha Mandal, 109

St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, 7, 17, 46
Stalin, 135
Statesman, 27, 40
Statham, 66, 150
Strock, M.J. Roy, 52
Students,
  after independence of India, 176-91
  civil disobedience movement and, 93-113
  impact of home rule movement on, 45-54, 62- 66, 83, 96
  non-cooperative movement and, 72-89
  quit India movement and, 118-38, 142-71
  role in politics, 57-69
  roots of unrest, 1-21
  swadeshi movement and, 26-40
Students' Association, 29
Students Literary Association, 29
Students Literary and Scientific Society, 19, 29
Subharoyan, P., 167
Sundaram, S., 105
Sundaram, V.A., 105
Suryodaya, 39
Swadeshamitram, 28
Swadeshi Steam Navigation Company, 39
Swaminathan, Ammu, 185-86

Tagore, Rabindra Nath, 5, 10, 17-18, 51
Tamil Tondar Padai, 83
Telugu Santi Sena, 83
Tellicherry National Students' Union, 165
Tenali bomb case, 38
Thakore, Dadabhai Paramanandadas, 47
Thathachari, T.R., 155
Thyagarajan, 129
Tilak, Balgangadhar, 38, 45-46, 72, 197, 199
Tinnevely Students' Association, 57
Tribune, 18
Trivandrum College, 20
Tuticorin bomb case, 38
Tyabji, Budruddin, 20

U.P. Students' Federation, 120

Varma, Kolli Ramakumara, 183
Varma, Ravindra, 180, 188, 190
Vasudev, Ballol, 168
Veeraraghavan, C., 188
Veershankar, 168
Venkanna, P., 164
Venkatachalam, P. R., 132
Venkatachari, Prathivadi Bhayankara, 34, 163
Venkataraman, K.S., 104
Venkateswaralu, Chivakula, 183
Venkatramaiyah, 34
Venkayya, Vakana, 39
Vijaya, 39
Vinayagan, 101
Viplara Jwala, 163
Voice of Youth, 107

Wake up India, 49
Warner, Lee, 8
Wesley College High School, 17
Western Star, 20
Wigham, Cuthbert, 98
Wilson, 3
Wood, Earnest, 4

Yadhavakula Youth League, 97
Yagnamurthy, C.M., 165
Young Bengal, 29
Young Citizens' Union, 83
Young India, 144
Young Liberator, 98
Young Men's Association, 29-30
Young Men's Hindu Association, 29
Young Utkal Association, 53
Youth, 78
Youth League, 97
Yugantar, 38

Zahir, H., 136

159490
S3577
C. C. L. ASHOKNAGAR HYDERABAD.
CHECKED 2001